DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 435 CE 019 737

TITLE	The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System. Volume Three. Corrections.
INSTITUTION	National Planning Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Dept. of Justice/LEAA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 78
CONTRACT	J-LEAA-035-74
NOTE	161p.; Notational, tabular, and excerpted information will not reproduce well due to small print. For related documents see ED 154 156, ED 160 738, ED 160 740, and ED 160 862-864
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 027-000-00661-2)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Rehabilitation; *Corrective Institutions; Criminal Law; Data Collection; Educational Programs; *Employment Projections; Employment Statistics; Employment Trends; *Job Training; Labor Turnover; Manpower Development; *Manpower Needs; National Surveys; Needs Assessment; Parole Officers; Program Effectiveness; *Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	*Correctional Personnel; Criminal Justice; Law Enforcement Education Program

ABSTRACT

Dealing specifically with custodial, treatment, parole, and executive personnel, this report on correctional personnel is one of eight volumes which comprise the full report of the National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System. Chapter and section titles include the following: (1) executive summary; (2) current manpower assessment (an overview of correctional manpower, state correctional institutions for adults, local jails, juvenile corrections, probation and parole agencies); (3) the outlook for correctional employment--manpower projections to 1985 (the projection scenario, key trends affecting corrections employment, projections of corrections employment, and assessment of key correctional developments); (4) recruitment and retention of corrections employees (recent recruitment and turnover experience, projected recruitment needs, and employment and recruitment of minorities and women); (5) education for correctional occupations (assessment of the educational attainment of correctional personnel, assessment of the educational attainment of probation and parole officers, assessment of correctional treatment personnel, efforts to upgrade the educational attainment of adult and corrections officers and of probation and parole personnel, the impact of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) upon the educational upgrading of personnel, and summary of the major findings and recommendations in correctional education); and (6) training for correctional occupations (standards; line personnel in adults corrections, juvenile child care workers, and probation and parole officers; and supervisory, treatment, and educational personnel.) (JH)

ED166435

The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System

Volume Three
Corrections

September 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CE 019 737

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice

National Institute of Law Enforcement and
Criminal Justice
Blair G. Ewing, Acting Director

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
James M.H. Gregg, Acting Administrator

This project was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-035-74 awarded to the National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402
Stock Number 027-000-00661-2

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD xv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xvi

PREFACE xvii

Chapter

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
  - A. Current Manpower Assessment 1
  - B. The Manpower Outlook 1
  - C. Recruitment and Retention 2
  - D. Education 2
  - E. Training 4
  - F. Critical Personnel Priorities 5

II. CURRENT MANPOWER ASSESSMENT 6
  - A. An Overview of Correctional Manpower 6
    - 1. Employment by type of agency 6
    - 2. Occupational distribution 6
    - 3. Correctional workload and employment trends 9
    - 4. Current correctional manpower problems 11
  - B. State Correctional Institutions for Adults 11
    - 1. Profile of state institutions 11
    - 2. Trends in inmate population 12
    - 3. Personnel requirements 14
    - 4. Executive assessments of personnel needs 15
    - 5. Inmate-Staff ratios 16
  - C. Local Jails 19
    - 1. Crowding in jails 20
    - 2. Jail employees 20
    - 3. Jail manpower needs 21
  - D. Juvenile Corrections 22
    - 1. Recent trends in juvenile residential populations and in staff employment 22
    - 2. Occupations in juvenile corrections facilities 23
    - 3. Administrators' assessments of manpower needs 24
    - 4. Staffing ratios 25
  - E. Probation and Parole Agencies 25
    - 1. Recent employment trends 26
    - 2. Executive assessments of manpower needs 26
    - 3. Staffing ratios 27
  - F. Conclusions 28
  - Notes and References 29

4

Chapter *Page*

III. THE OUTLOOK FOR CORRECTIONS EMPLOYMENT: MANPOWER PROJECTIONS TO 1985 31
  A. Introduction 31
  B. The Projection Scenario 31
  C. Key Trends Affecting Corrections Employment 33
    1. Imprisonment trends 33
    2. The trend to community-based programs 34
    3. The growth in probation and parole activities 34
    4. Staffing ratios 34
  D. Projections of Corrections Employment 35
  E. Assessment of Key Correctional Developments 37
    1. Increased use of community-based facilities 37
    2. Work and study release programs 39
    3. Recent developments in sentencing policies 40
    4. Mandatory minimum sentences 41
  F. Conclusions 42
  Notes and References 43

IV. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES 44
  A. Introduction 44
  B. Recent Recruitment and Turnover Experience 44
    1. Survey results 44
    2. Factors affecting personnel turnover 47
  C. Projected Recruitment Needs 48
  D. Employment and Recruitment of Minorities and Women 49
    1. Trends in employment of minorities and women in line correctional positions 49
    2. Comparisons with racial characteristics of inmates 50
    3. Occupational distribution of minorities and women in corrections 51
    4. Recruitment of minorities and women 54
  Notes and References 54

V. EDUCATION FOR CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS 56
  A. Introduction 56
  B. Assessment of the Educational Attainment of Correctional Personnel 57
    1. Standards for the assessment of the educational attainment of line and supervisory custodial personnel in corrections 57
    2. The educational attainment of correctional custody personnel 60
    3. Patterns in educational attainment of custodial personnel by age 63
    4. Educational attainment of custody personnel by date of entry 65
    5. The educational attainment of correctional custody personnel by geographic region 67
  C. Assessment of the Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Officers: Standards and Levels 68
    1. Educational standards 68
    2. Educational levels of attainment 71

Chapter *Page*

3. Patterns in the educational attainment of probation and parole personnel by age 72
4. The educational attainment of probation and parole personnel by period of entry 73
5. The educational attainment of probation and parole officers by geographic region 74

D. Assessment of Correctional Treatment Personnel: Standards and Levels 75
1. Standards 75
2. The educational levels of attainment of correctional line treatment personnel 78

E. Efforts To Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers 79

F. Efforts to Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Officers 81

G. Efforts To Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Personnel 83

H. The Impact of LEEP Upon the Educational Upgrading of Correctional Personnel 85

I. Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations in Correctional Education 86

Notes and References 88

VI. TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS 89

A. Existing Training Standards 90
1. American Correctional Association 90
2. The President's Commission 90
3. The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training 90
4. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals 90
5. State and agency standards 91

B. Training for Line Personnel in Adults Corrections 91
1. Entry-level training 91
2. In-service training 100
3. Training of correctional officers for counseling duties 103
4. Major findings in adult corrections training 105

C. Training for Juvenile Child Care Workers 106
1. Provision of training 106
2. Entry-level training 108
3. In-service training 112
4. Major findings relating to training for child care workers 115

D. Training for Probation and Parole Officers 116
1. Provision of training 116
2. Entry-level training 118

E. Assessment of the Length of Entry-Level Training 120
1. Content of training 120
2. In-service training 125
3. Summary and conclusions 129

F. Supervisory Training in Corrections 130

G. Training for Correctional Treatment and Educational Personnel ... 131

Chapter *Page*

H. Major Findings and Conclusions in Correctional Training 133
  1. Adult corrections 133
  2. Juvenile corrections 133
  3. Probation and parole 134
  4. Correctional supervisors 134
  5. Correctional treatment and educational personnel 134
  6. General findings 134
  7. Recommendations 136

Notes and References 136

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 139

TABLES

Table		Page
II–1	State and Local Correctional Employees, By Type of Agency, 1974	7
II–2	Estimated Distribution of Full-Time Equivalent Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities, by Major Occupational Group: 1974	8
II–3	Estimated Employment of Supervisors and Line Personnel in Selected Correctional Occupations, 1974	9
II–4	Indicators of Correctional Workloads for Adult and Juvenile Offenders, 1965–1974	10
II–5	Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities: 1965–1974	10
II–6	Responses by Correctional Administrators and Sheriffs on "Most Serious Manpower Problem" and on "Major Factor Contributing to Most Serious Problem"	12
II–7	Institutions, Inmates, and Custodial Personnel in State Adult Correctional Facilities, By Type of Institution, 1974	13
II–8	Inmates in State Adult Correctional Facilities, By Region, Selected Years: 1950–1975	13
II–9	Inmate Ratios Per 100,000 Population Per Age Group, 1974, and Percent Changes in Population by Age Group, 1970–1975	14
II–10	Percent Distribution of Conventional Prisons by Relation of Inmate Population to Designed Capacity and By Size, 1975	14
II–11	Employment in State Correctional Facilities for Adults, by Occupational Group, 1962 and 1974	15
II–12	Distribution of Executives' Views of the Most Important Goals for their Agency, State Adult Correctional Facilities, 1975	16
II–13	Responses by Executives on "Most Important Goal," By Size and Type of Facility, State Adult Corrections, 1975	16
II–14	Percent Change in Staffing Reported as Necessary for Effective Performance in State Adult Correctional Facilities, by Size and Type of Facility, 1975	17
II–15	Ratios of Inmates to Custodial Officers in State Adult Correctional Facilities: Selected Years, 1960–1975	17
II–16	Ratio of Inmates to Custodial Officers in Conventional State Prisons, By Type of Security and Whether Prison was Overcrowded, 1975	18
II–17	Percent of States Meeting Recommended Staffing Standards for Selected Types of Specialists in State Adult Correctional Facilities, By Region, 1974	19
II–18	Distribution of Conventional Prisons by Number of Inmates Per Treatment Worker, and by Size, 1975	19
II–19	Inmate Population of Jails by Type of Detention, March 1970	20
II–20	Percent of Jails Offering Selected Services to Inmates, by Size of Jail, 1975	20
II–21	Distribution of Sheriffs' Jails by Relation of Number of Inmates to Designed Capacity and by Size, 1975	21
II–22	Employment by Occupational Group in Local Jails, 1975	21

Table *Page*

II–23 Distribution of Selected Professional Employees in Jails, by Size of Jail, 1972 22
II–24 Number of Public Detention and Correctional Facilities for Juveniles, and Number of Juveniles, by Type of Facility and Level of Government, July 30, 1974 23
II–25 Juveniles in Custody by Type of Facility, 1971 and 1974 24
II–26 Distribution of Employment in State and Local Juvenile Correctional Facilities, by Type of Facility and by Occupational Group, 1973 24
II–27 Executives' Views of Percent Change Needed in Staffing for Juvenile Corrections Activities, by Size of Agency, 1975 25
II-27A Number of Juvenile Residents per Employee in Selected Occupational Groups, in Juvenile Correctional Institutions, 1965 and 1975 . . 25
II–28 Employment in State and Local Probation and Parole Agencies By Level of Government, 1974 26
II–29 Estimated Distribution of Probation and Parole Workloads by Type of Activity, 1975 26
II–30 Employment in Probation and Parole Activities, in States and Large Counties and Cities, 1971–74 27
II-30A Executives' Judgments of Increase in Staff Needed for Full Effective Performance, State and Local Probation and Parole Agencies, 1975 27
II–31 Percent Distribution of Probation and Parole Agencies by Size of Workload Per Probation or Parole Office and by Type of Agency . . . 28
III–1 Trends in Crimes, Arrests, and Imprisonment Actual: 1971, 1974; Projected: 1980, 1985 34
III–2 Current and Projected Corrections Employment by Level of Government and Function 35
III–3 Employment in Selected Correctional Occupations: Actual: 1974; Projected: 1980, 1985 36
III–4 Responses by Correctional Executives on Current and Expected Use of Community-Based Facilities or Halfway Houses, 1975 38
III–5 Executive Responses on Effects of the Adoption of Work and Study Release Programs on Personnel and Skill Needs 40
IV–1 Percent of Agency Executives Reporting Recruitment and Turnover Problems in Key Occupations During 1971–74 44
IV–2 Personnel Turnover Rates in Selected Correctional Occupations, By Size of Agency, FY 1974 45
IV–3 Percent of Correctional Administrators Reporting Recruitment and Retention Problems in Key Occupations, in Joint Commission Survey for 1967 and in National Manpower Survey for 1971–74 46
IV–4 Estimated Annual Recruitment Needs in Line Correctional Occupations: Actual, FY 1974; Projected, 1974–1980; 1980–85 48
IV–5 Percent of Minorities Employed in Line Custodial Positions in State and Local Correctional Institutions, Selected Years: 1960–74 50
IV–6 Blacks as Percent of Custodial Officers and of Inmate Populations in State Prisions for Selected States, by LEAA Region, 1973–74 51
IV–7 Persons Employed in Corrections Agencies by Race/Ethnic Group and Occupation Group, 1974 52
IV–8 Persons Employed in Correctional Agencies by Occupation and Sex: 1974 53
IV–9 Percent of Minorities and of Women Employed as Administrators of Correctional Institutions and Probation and Parole Agencies:

Table *Page*

1975 53

IV–10 Recruitment and Retention Ratios of Custodial Officers, by Race and Ethnic Group, and by Sex, 1973–74 54

V–1 State Educational Recruitments for Correctional Officers, 1973 59

V–2 Current Agency Minimum Educational Requirements 59

V–3 Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Officers, 1974 60

V–4 Degrees Earned by Adult Corrections Officers, 1974 61

V–5 Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Custody Supervisors, 1974 62

V–6 Degrees Attained by Adult Corrections Custody Supervisors 62

V–7 Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, 1974 62

V–8 Degrees Earned by Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, 1974 63

V–9 Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Supervisors, 1974 63

V–10 Degrees Attained by Juvenile Corrections Custody Supervisors, 1974 63

V–11 Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Line Officers and Supervisors, by Age: 1974 64

V–12 Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers and Supervisors, by Age: 1974 65

V–13 Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers at Time of Entry into Current Agency, and Currently, by Period of Entry 66

V–14 Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers at Time of Entry into Current Agency, and Currently, by Period of Entry 66

V–15 Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers by Census Region, 1974 68

V–16 Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, by Census Region 69

V–17 State Educational Standards for Probation and Parole Officers, 1974–75 70

V–18 Minimum Educational Requirements of Probation and Parole Agencies, 1974 70

V–19 Number of Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers, 1974 71

V–20 Degrees Attained by Probation and Parole Officers, 1974 71

V–21 Number of Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Supervisors, 1974 71

V–22 Degrees Attained by Probation and Parole Supervisors, 1974 72

V–23 Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Workers and Supervisors, by Age, 1975 72

V–24 The Educational Attainment of Incumbent Probation and Parole Officers at Time of Entry into Current Agency of Employment, and Currently, by Period of Entry 73

V–25 Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Officers, by Census Region, 1974 75

V–26 Number of Years of Education Attained by Adult and Juvenile Corrections Line Treatment Personnel in 1974 79

V–27 Degrees Held by Adult and Juvenile Corrections Line Treatment Personnel in 1974 79

V–28 Additional Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections

Table *Page*

Officers and Supervisors Since Entry into Current Agency, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974 81
V–29 Additional Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Entry into Their Current Agency, by length of Service, 1974 81
V–30 Additional Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974 82
V–31 Additional Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Length of Service, 1974 83
V–32 Percentage of Correctional Agencies Implementing Various Policies to Encourage Continuing Education Among Incumbent Staff, by Type of Correctional Agency, 1975 84
V–33 Additional Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers and Supervisors since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974 84
V–34 Additional Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Length of Service, 1974 85
V–35 Proportion of Correctional Personnel Participating in LEEP, by Correctional Occupation, 1974 85
V–36 Percentage of Line and Supervisory Personnel Raising Their Educational Attainment by At Least One Year by Status of LEEP Participation: Incumbent Personnel with Five or Less Years of Service 86
VI–1 Level at Which the Duration of Entry-Level Training is Determined in Adult and Juvenile Corrections, 1975 91
VI–2 Percentage of Adult Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training to New Correctional Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975 92
VI–3 Locations of Entry-Level Training in Adult Corrections, 1975 92
VI–4 Distribution of the Duration of Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975 93
VI–5 Duration of Entry-Level Training in Adult Corrections Agencies, by Level at Which Training Length is Determined, 1975 94
VI–6 Percentages of Formal Entry-Level Training Time Devoted to Various Training Areas in Adult Corrections 96
VI–7 Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975 97
VI–8 Levels of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Adult Corrections Executives, 1975 98
VI–9 Provision of In-Service Training to Correctional Officers by Adult Corrections Agencies, by Size of Agency, 1975 100
VI–10 Location of In-Service Training in Adult Corrections, 1975 101
VI–11 Reported Duration of In-Service Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975 102
VI–12 Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training for New Corrections Officers by Size of Agency, 1975 103
VI–13 Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Adult Corrections Executives, 1975 104
VI–14 Provisions and Source of Counseling Training in Adult Correctional Agencies Assigning Counseling Duties to Correctional Officers, 1975 104

Table *Page*

VI–15 Percentages of Correctional Officers in Adult Agencies Receiving Training in Counseling, 1975 105

VI–16 Training Provided to Child Care Workers in Juvenile Corrections, by Type of Agency, 1975 106

VI–17 Training Provided to Child Care Workers in Juvenile Corrections by Type of Agency, 1975 107

VI–18 Location of Entry-Level Training for Child Care Workers, 1975 108

VI–19 Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, by Size of Agency, 1975 109

VI–20 Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Child Care Workers, by Type of Agency, 1975 109

VI–21 Percentage of Agencies Covering Selected Training Topics in Entry-Level Training for New Child Care Workers, By Size of Agency, 1975 110

VI–22 Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Juvenile Corrections Executives, 1975 111

VI–23 Location of In-Service Training for Child Care Workers, 1975 113

VI–24 Duration of In-Service Training Provided to Child Care Workers by Type of Agency, 1975 113

VI–25 Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Juvenile Corrections Executives, 1975 114

VI–26 Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training Provided to Child Care Workers, by Type of Agency, 1975 115

VI–27 Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975 117

VI–28 Locations of Formal Entry-Level Training for Probation/Parole Officers, 1975 118

VI–29 Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Probation and Parole Officers, By Type of Agency, 1975 119

VI–30 Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Probation and Parole Executives, 1975 122

VI–31 Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Officers Employed in Combined Probation and Parole Agencies 123

VI–32 Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Probation Officers, 1975 124

VI–33 Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Parole Officers, 1975 124

VI–34 Proportions of Probation and Parole Officers Provided In-Service Training, By Type of Agency, 1975 125

VI–35 Average Duration of In-Service Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975 126

VI–36 Percentages of Probation Agencies Providing In-Service Training in Selected Topics, 1975 127

VI–37 Percentages of Parole Agencies Providing In-Service Training in Selected Topics, 1975 128

VI–38 Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training for Officers of Consolidated Probation/Parole Agencies, 1975 128

VI–39 Levels of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Probation and Parole Executives, 1975 129

VI–40 Proportion of Corrections Agencies Requiring Supervisory Training of Newly Appointed Supervisory Personnel, by Type of Corrections Agency, 1975 131

Table		Page
VI–41	Percentage of Adult Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training to New Treatment and Educational Personnel by Size of Agency	132
VI–42	Percentage of Juvenile Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training for Treatment and Educational Staff, by Type of Agency, 1975	132
VI–43	Length of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Treatment and Educational Personnel in Adult Corrections; By Size of Agency, 1975	132
VI–44	Length of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Treatment and Educational Personnel in Juvenile Corrections, by Type of Agency, 1975	133

CHARTS

Chart		Page
V–1.	Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Corrections Officers	III–60
V–2.	Tasks Performed by Counselors in Adult Corrections Institutions	III–78
VI–1.	Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Corrections Officer	III–99
VI–2.	Primary Areas of Knowledge Required for Adult Corrections Officers	III–99
VI–3.	Principal Areas of Skill and Knowledge Required of Child Care Workers	III–111
VI–4.	Principal Tasks Performed by Child Care Workers	III–112
VI–5.	Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Probation and Parole Officers	III–121
VI–6.	Primary Areas of Knowledge Required for Adult Probation Officers	III–121
VI–7.	Principal Tasks Performed by Supervisors in Corrections	III–130
VI–8.	Principal Areas of Skill and Knowledge Required of Correctional Supervisors	III–130
VI–9.	Future Skill and Knowledge Expanded Requirements for Correctional Personnel	III–135
VI–10.	Newer Job and Expanded Role Developments in Corrections	III–135

FOREWORD

The criminal justice system is a labor-intensive enterprise, vital to the nation and beset with manpower problems. One of the most recent attempts to help alleviate some of the problems was the National Manpower Survey. The Congressional mandate for this survey was written in 1973, the survey was begun in 1974 and completed last year.

This volume deals specifically with custodial, treatment, parole, and executive personnel. Recruitment, retention, training, education, and critical personnel priorities are dealt with for adult and juvenile institutions and local jails.

The survey results do not provide final answers to all of the manpower issues. In particular, the assumptions built into the model for projecting manpower requirements may have to be modified in light of additional experience. Nevertheless, the Institute believes the study represents a significant advance in the tools available to deal with manpower problems. We hope it will be of value to the many hundreds of state and local officials who must plan for manpower needs.

Blair G. Ewing
Acting Director
National Institute of Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to express our appreciation to the many individuals who are daily engaged in providing corrections administration and services to the many institutions and activities, adult and juvenile, and who gave their time and attention to our questions and inquiries. Special thanks are due to the superintendents, wardens, and other executives of adult and juvenile institutions and community-based activities who responded to our formal questionnaires. We also wish to express our appreciation to those corrections specialists who have studied the problems of corrections and who are alert to the need for change and re-direction. They helped us, along with superintendents and wardens, to identify the real issues and to keep our study in focus with the realities of day-to-day operations.

We found the correctional community intensely alive, concerned about the future, and most willing to share with us their definitions of the problems and their insights about what might be done about solutions.

Finally, the burden of distilling the essential data for analysis fell upon the research staff of the National Planning Association. The following individuals worked diligently and far beyond their normal duty hours to master the information and to undertake the extensive analysis necessary to develop the findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this volume: Bernard Gilman, Harry Greenspan, Linda Harris, Rigney Hill, Paul Radtke, and Robert W. Rafuse, Jr.

To our senior administrative and research services staff, we owe special thanks for their professional zeal in the following critical areas: Loraine Halsey, for managing the administrative and financial services necessary to complete this volume, and Elizabeth McGovern Naden, for building the research library facilities and providing research services to the entire staff, including the development of the references and bibliography for this volume.

The productivity of our administrative and secretarial staff over long days and weekends to see this document through final copy deserves special recognition. These include: Violet Barnes, Leigh Dyer, Linda Kinsman, Mary Joan McDuffie, Cynthia Payne, Jacqueline Rupel, Lorraine Staliper, and Margaret Takenaka.

PREFACE

The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System is an LEAA-funded study conducted in response to a Congressional requirement, under the 1973 Crime Control Act, for a survey of personnel training and education needs in the fields of law enforcement and criminal justice, and of the adequacy of federal, state, and local programs to meet these needs.

This volume on correctional personnel is one of a series of eight volumes (listed below) which comprise the full report of the National Manpower Survey. The overall scope of the study, including descriptions of methodology and data sources, are included in the Summary Report (Volume I) and—in more detail—in Volumes VI, VII, and VIII. An extensive analysis of corrections education and training programs is included in Volume V, and supplements the training and educational needs assessments included in the present volume.

The six volumes published under this study are:

- Volume I (Summary Report)
- Volume II (Law Enforcement)
- Volume III (Corrections)
- Volume IV (Courts)
- Volume V (Education and Training)
- Volume VI (Manpower Planning)

CHAPTER I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Current Manpower Assessment

- *Three sets of criteria have been used to assess current manpower needs of correctional agencies.* These include: (1) analyses of recent workload and staffing trends; (2) assessments of manpower needs by correctional administrators; and (3) comparisons of current staff-workload ratios with professionally recommended standards.
- *Workload trends have been mixed for the major categories of correctional agencies.* Probation and parole agencies experienced the most rapid growth since the mid-1960's, based on available evidence. Inmate populations in state adult correctional institutions declined during the 1960's, but increased by 23 percent between 1972 and 1976, resulting in severe overcrowding in a number of state systems. Local jail inmate populations declined between 1970 and 1972, but have also probably increased since then. On the other hand, the number of juveniles in state institutions declined by over 30 percent between 1970 and 1974, as a result of increased emphasis upon community-based corrections and of the transfer of status offenders out of correctional institutions in some states.
- *Employment in state adult and juvenile institutions increased relative to size of inmate populations, between the late 1960's and 1974, with resultant reductions in inmate-staff ratios.* Preliminary estimates, however, indicate a reversal of this trend in 1975, in the case of adult institutions, as a result of the continued rapid growth of prison populations.
- *Assessments by correctional administrators indicate substantial manpower shortages in probation and parole agencies; smaller needs in other agency categories.* Percentage increases in staff required, as estimated by correctional administrators surveyed by the NMS, averaged 36 percent for probation and parole offices, 20 percent for state adult facilities and 15 percent for state juvenile facilities. Sheriffs—whose functions include both corrections and police protection—reported a requirement for a 34 percent increase in staffing.
- *Manpower shortages, as reported by correctional administrators, were proportionately greater for specialized personnel than for line officers.* Administrators of state adult facilities reported a need for an increase of 42 percent for treatment specialists (psychiatrists, social workers, counselors) as compared with 14 percent for custodial officers. Heads of juvenile corrections facilities similarly reported an average shortage of 29 percent in treatment specialists, as against 12 percent for child care workers.
- *Analysis of existing staffing ratios in relation to professionally recommended standards also indicated deficits of treatment specialists and case workers in all agency categories, but most severe in the case of jails.* Probation and parole case loads were also found to be much higher in most agencies than those considered acceptable by recent Commission studies.

B. The Manpower Outlook

- *Total correctional employment is expected to increase by 60 percent, from 203,000 in 1974 to 324,000 in 1985, in terms of full-time equivalent employees.* This rate of growth, although much greater than that projected for state and local government employment as a whole, is considerably lower than the growth rate in corrections experienced between 1971–74, reflecting the combined effects of: (1) curtailed government revenues, as a result of the recent economic recession, and (2) a projected slowdown in crime rates, mainly due to the prospective decline in the youth population.
- *The number of prisoners in state institutions is projected to increase from 217,000 in early 1976 to 243,000 in 1980 and 252,000 in 1985.* This growth assumes a continuation of the recent trend towards increased imprisonment of serious offenders. However, limits imposed by prison capacities and by the high costs of prison construction and operation, were expected to reduce the rate of growth, as compared with that experienced in 1974–76.

18

- *Probation and parole agencies will grow more rapidly than other types of correctional agencies.* Employment in these agencies will more than double between 1974 and 1985. Growth will be particularly rapid at the state level, reflecting a continued trend towards integration of probation and parole activities.
- *Adult correctional institutions are expected to increase their staffing by about 58 percent.* This will allow for some further overall increase in staff-inmate ratios.
- *Juvenile correctional agencies will experience the slowest net growth.* Employment increases in local juvenile facilities are expected to offset a projected employment reduction in state institutions.
- *Among key correctional occupations,* relatively rapid growth is projected for line custodial officers in adult institutions, for management personnel, and for probation and parole officers. Slower growth is projected for child care workers.
- *Recent developments in sentencing policies, including a trend towards fixed sentences, and to mandatory minimum sentences, could have important effects on future correctional manpower needs.* Insufficient experience is available, however, to assess their potential impact at this time.

C. Recruitment and Retention

- *High personnel turnover among line staff has been a chronic personnel problem in correctional institutions.* In FY 1974, prior to the recent recession, quit rates averaged 19.1 percent for correctional officers in state institutions, 27.2 percent for child care workers. These were very similar to rates reported in an earlier 1967 survey, and reflect continued dissatisfaction wih low pay and unsatisfactory working conditions. Field reports indicate reductions in personnel turnover since 1974, as a result of increased unemployment.
- *Recruitment problems were also widespread in the period prior to the recent recession.* Difficulties in recruitment of qualified personnel for custodial positions during the early 1970's were reported by 42 percent of state adult correctional facility administrators, and by 34 percent of heads of juvenile institutions. Problems in recruitment of teachers and treatment personnel, however, were cited much less frequently.
- *Recruitment needs for line personnel are expected to decline significantly in the period 1975-80, as compared with 1974 levels.* This will result from lower projected turnover rates, as well as from the anticipated slowdown in employment growth. Higher levels of personnel turnover and recruitment are projected for 1980-85, under an assumed improvement in the overall job market during this period. However, correctional agencies will still be in a relatively more favorable recruitment situation than in the early 1970's.
- *Employment of minorities as custodial officers has increased during the past decade, according to several available statistical measures.* In 1974, blacks and Spanish-Americans comprised over one-fifth of the work force in line custodial officer jobs.
- *However, blacks continued to comprise a much smaller proportion of the custodial force than of the inmate population.* Among states with large proportions of black inmates, only five states reported percentages of black custodial officers which were at least one-half as great as their inmate population ratio.
- *Women have experienced a small increase in their share of line correctional positions in 1974.* They continue to be concentrated in juvenile institutions or in positions involving supervision of women inmates.
- *Both minority personnel and women employees are still disproportionately concentrated in the lower-level positions in correctional agencies.* In 1975, the percentage of minority personnel holding executive positions ranged from 4 percent in probation and parole, and 9 percent in adult institutions, to 13 percent in juvenile institutions. This, however, represents a marked improvement since 1967, when only 3 percent of correctional administrators were black.
- *Both minorities and women have had lower turnover rates in line correctional positions than other personnel.* This factor, in addition to continued emphasis on affirmative action programs, may serve to further increase their share of these positions.

D. Education

- *The pattern of educational attainment among correctional occupations forms a discernable hierarchy based upon rank, function, and class of offender served.* In terms of average educational attainment, the various occupations in corrections may be ordered as follows: adult corrections officer (12 years of education), adult corrections custodial supervisor (12 years of education), juvenile corrections child care workers (13 years of education), juvenile corrections custodial supervisor (14 years of education), juvenile corrections treatment personnel (14 years of education), adult corrections treatment personnel (15 years of education), probation and parole line officer (16 years of education), and probation and parole supervisor (17 years of education).

- *In adult and juvenile corrections, educational attainment is higher among younger than among older personnel.* This pattern reflects the general upgrading of educational attainment among entrants to the labor force and, predictably, will result in continued improvement in overall educational levels of correctional personnel as older employees leave the work force.
- *The rate of increase in educational attainment has been more rapid for juvenile correctional personnel than for those in adult institutions.* Comparisons of educational attainment at entry, by age, indicate that, whereas the educational attainment of newly hired adult corrections officers remained heavily oriented to the 12-year high school education level, juvenile corrections appears to have increasingly recruited from among those with one or more years of college.
- *Educational levels in probation and parole appear to have remained fairly stable, as indicated by the distribution of current personnel by age.* There was, however, an apparent decline in the early 1960's in the educational attainment of newly appointed officers. A significantly larger proportion of current personnel, who were originally employed prior to 1960, had attained 17 or more years of education when they were hired than in any subsequent group of new hires. The large increase in demand for probation and parole officers, coupled with general shortages of college trained personnel in the 1960's, appears to have resulted in a reduction in entry-level educational standards during this period. However, the trend since the early 1960's has been one of gradual improvement in entry-level attainment, so that by the most recent period the educational level of new entrants was only marginally below that of the pre-1960 cohort.
- *Educational upgrading among in-service personnel has also contributed to the higher current educational levels of younger custodial personnel.* Nearly one-fifth of adult and juvenile corrections line personnel, including supervisors, added at least one year of education since entry. The proportion increasing their educational attainment was highest among those entering between 1965 and 1969: 37 percent for juvenile corrections personnel, 29 percent for adult corrections personnel.
- *Probation and parole officers have participated in continuing education, after entry into service, at a higher rate than line correctional officers.* Over 30 percent of all probation and parole officers reported one or more years of additional education following entry, as compared with about 20 percent of adult corrections officers. The highest upgrading rate (44 percent) was among those who entered between 1965 and 1969.
- *The LEEP program assisted in financing the continuing education of about one-third of line personnel in adult corrections and probation and parole, and of about one-fifth of those in juvenile corrections,* based on experience of those who entered service since initiation of LEEP.
- *Employees engaged in treatment, educational, and counseling functions in correctional agencies reported a particularly wide range of educational attainment.* At one extreme, 32 percent of these personnel in adult agencies and 19 percent in juvenile agencies had one or more years of graduate education; at the other extreme, 16 percent of adult treatment personnel and 20 percent in juvenile agencies had only a high school education or less. Thirty-eight percent of all adult treatment personnel and almost 45 percent of juvenile treatment personnel reported an educational attainment below 16 years. (Included in the broad category of treatment and training personnel in the 1974 Census Employee Characteristics Survey were employees in such occupations as social worker, psychologist, and teacher as well as others identified as performing counseling functions, exclusive of paraprofessionals and aides.)
- *Based on recommended educational standards, treatment and educational personnel—as a group—are most in need of educational upgrading.* Standards for this category of personnel, including those proposed by the National Advi-

sory Commission on Standards and Goals and the American Correctional Association, all recommended a 4-year college education as the minimum entry requirement. The deficit is most severe in the case of treatment personnel working with juveniles, where 45 percent did not meet this standard in 1974.

E. Training

- *In general there has been an improvement in the provision of training by agencies in the three major areas of corrections.* In each of the three major categories of agencies—adult corrections, juvenile corrections, and probation and parole—the proportion of agencies providing some form of entry-level or in-service training, has increased significantly since the late 1960's.
- *The greatest degree of improvement in training has been in adult corrections.* Virtually all adult corrections agencies now provide entry-level training to new correctional officers and 85 percent of all agencies provide some form of in-service training.
- *The lowest level of agency training is in juvenile corrections.* Twenty-eight percent of juvenile corrections agencies provide no training of any sort, 21 percent provide only in-service training, and 8 percent provide only entry-level training. Thus, less than half the agencies—43 percent—provide both training at entry and in-service training to their personnel.
- *The amount of training provided in probation and parole is only marginally better than that found in juvenile corrections.* Twenty percent of probation and parole agencies provide no training to their personnel, 22 percent provide only in-service training, and 8 percent provide training only at entry. Thus, only 50 percent of all agencies provide both entry and in-service training.
- *Entry-level training, when it is offered, is almost always mandatory for all new personnel.* With the exception of those agencies that waive entry-level training for new personnel with previous correctional experience, entry-level training is virtually always required in those agencies providing such training.
- *The proportion of line personnel receiving in-service training each year is significantly lower in adult corrections than in either juvenile corrections or probation and parole.* Whereas only 10 percent or less of adult officers receive in-service training per year, the average proportion receiving such training in juvenile corrections and probation and parole is in excess of 70 percent each year.
- *Although most training is still provided at the agency of employment, increasing use is being made of community and regional training resources.* In all three areas of corrections, and for both entry and in-service training, the location most frequently utilized is the agency itself. Correctional administrators, however, report plans for greater utilization of centralized training facilities, such as state or regional academies, and to a lesser extent, of local educational facilities such as community colleges.
- *The amount of time devoted to training in most agencies seldom meets or exceeds the minimum standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission.* The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended standards of 100 hours for entry-level training and 40 hours annually for in-service training. For adult corrections officers in agencies providing training, the average duration of entry-level training is 107 hours and the average duration of in-service training is 62 hours. However, only about half of the adult agencies meet or exceed the National Advisory Commission standards. In juvenile corrections the average duration of entry and in-service training was 30 and 34 hours respectively, and only a handful of agencies met or exceeded the National Advisory Commission standards. In probation and parole the average duration of entry and in-service training was 61 and 38 hours respectively, and fewer than half the agencies met or exceeded recommended standards.
- *The content of the training provided in corrections appears to coincide in large part with the custodial duties and areas of knowledge required of correctional line personnel.* In adult corrections the training topics concentrate on custodial and security related functions, which remain the primary areas of responsibility for correctional officers. Some training deficiency was noted in the area of human values and behavior and the provision of counseling services—an area of current importance, particularly in agencies that emphasize a rehabilitative milieu. In juvenile corrections and probation and parole a similar agreement between occu-

pational demands and training content was found. However, in juvenile corrections particularly, the relatively short period of time devoted to training and the practice of providing training only on an in-service basis suggest that topical coverage may not be adequate. In probation and parole the large proportion of agencies providing only in-service training also suggests a probable training deficiency.

- *Supervisory training is required, however, by only a small proportion of agencies in all categories.* Despite a clear indication of sentiment in favor of requiring supervisory training on the part of correctional executives, and evidence of a need to provide additional training on the basis of the occupational analysis, only 8.3 percent of adult corrections agencies, 12.6 percent of juvenile corrections agencies, and 12.5 percent of probation and parole agencies require such training as a matter of policy.
- *The level of training provided to new rehabilitative staff in adult corrections is generally below the level provided to new line custodial officers.* Whereas entry-level training is provided to new custodial personnel in virtually all adult corrections agencies, only 76 percent provide such training to new treatment and educational personnel. The average duration of this training is 71 hours compared to 107 hours for custodial personnel. Size of agency is a major factor in that larger agencies are more likely to provide entry-level training than smaller agencies. However, the amount of time devoted to the training is greater on the average in smaller than in larger agencies.
- *The level of training provided to juvenile corrections rehabilitative personnel is comparable to that provided to line custodial personnel, but significantly less than that provided in adult corrections.* Only 45 percent of juvenile corrections agencies provide entry level training to new treatment and educational personnel. The average duration of that training is approximately 31 hours.
- *Management training for correctional executives falls short of the rising demands for more leadership skills and knowledge about major functional areas of correctional management.* The highest demands for training of executives are on such subjects as budget and fiscal management, collective bargaining, personnel management, community relations, and utilization of community resources. (Volume V of this report covers in detail the managerial training needs of both correctional and law enforcement executives.)

F. Critical Personnel Priorities

Although significant staffing and personnel upgrading needs have been identified for most correctional activities, the following priority areas appear most in need of improvement based on the NMS assessment.

Staffing

- *Probation and parole staffs, including both case workers and support personnel.*
- *Treatment and educational staffs, adult facilities.*

Education

- *Treatment and educational staffs, in both adult and juvenile facilities.*

Training

- *Probation and parole officers*
- *Juvenile corrections personnel*
- *Managerial personnel*
- *Supervisors*

CHAPTER II.
CURRENT MANPOWER ASSESSMENT

A. An Overview of Correctional Manpower

The correctional function, as defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, includes governmental agencies responsible for the confinement and rehabilitation of offenders, as well as probation and parole. It encompasses a particularly complex and diversified range of activities which begin at the stage of presentence investigations of adjudicated offenders and which continue until offenders complete their periods of confinement, probation, or parole. Agencies performing these functions are further differentiated by type of offender group served (e.g., adults or juveniles), and—in the case of institutions—by such characteristics as length of detention, degree of security, and the types of work, training, or rehabilitation activities pursued.

This introductory section provides summary information on the overall distribution of correctional manpower by agency category and occupation, on the major trends affecting workloads of correctional activities, and on current manpower problems of correctional agencies, as reported by correctional administrators. The following sections present more detailed analyses of manpower staffing needs for each of the four major categories of correctional agencies: state institutions for adults, local jails, juvenile institutions, and probation and parole agencies.

1. *Employment by type of agency*. As in other law enforcement and criminal justice activities, responsibility for corrections is largely concentrated at the state and local levels—with state governments, particularly, exercising the central role. In 1974, state governments accounted for 122,600, or 54 percent of the total of 226,800 correctional employees at all levels of government. An additional 94,100 were employed by local governments, mainly at the county level. Federal employees (excluded from the scope of the present study) accounted for only 10,100 or 4.5 percent of total correctional manpower, and were mainly employed by two agencies: the Bureau of Prisons, which operates the federal penitentiaries, and the Federal Probation Service.

The major categories of state and local agencies are described below:

- Correctional institutions designed primarily for adult offenders accounted for 106,000, or 52 percent of total state and local correctional employment, based on full-time equivalents (Table II–1). These included about 66,000 state employees in state prisons, road camps, prison farms and related activities, as well as 40,000 employees of county and municipal jail facilities. Most of the latter are operated by county sheriffs' offices.
- Juvenile institutions employed 43,000 full-time equivalent employees in 1974. State juvenile institutions, such as training schools, ranches, and camps, accounted for 29,000, or two-thirds, of this total. Locally-operated facilities, such as detention centers, or group homes, employed an additional 14,000. The latter total excludes publicly-funded community-based juvenile residential facilities if the latter are operated by a non-governmental agency.
- State and local probation and parole activities accounted for 46,000 full-time equivalent employees in 1974. These activities are performed in a large variety of organizational contexts, including independent state-level agencies or boards, agencies affiliated with correctional departments, and units affiliated with court systems. About 27,000, or three-fifths of probation and parole staff were employed by local governments.
- An additional 8,000 correctional employees were in administrative or miscellaneous activities, mainly at the central administrative level of state correctional "headquarters" agencies.

2. *Occupational distribution*. Large correctional institutions, such as state prisons and juvenile training centers, are—in many respects—self-contained communities. In addition to their primary responsibilities for assuring secure custody of inmates and for their rehabilitation, their work forces must provide for feeding of inmates, for maintenance of facilities and grounds, and for specialized inmate

Table II–1

State and Local Correctional Employees, by Type of Agency: 1974

(Full-time equivalents, numbers in thousands)

Type of Agency	Total		State		Local[a]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	**203**	**100**	**121**	**100**	**82**	**100**
Adult correctional facilities	106	52	66	55	40	49
Juvenile institutions	43	21	29	24	14	17
Probation/Parole	46	22	18	15	27	33
Administrative and miscellaneous	8	4	7	6	1	1

[a] Estimates of distribution of local employment by type of agency based on data for 384 cities and 312 counties, which accounted for 84 percent of total local corrections employment.

Source: LEAA/Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1947*, Tables 9, 45, 46, 47.

services, including medical and dental care, recreational activities and religious services, in addition to usual administrative staff services. Although all of these personnel are essential to the effective functioning of correctional institutions, the present report—like earlier assessments of correctional manpower—has placed primary emphasis on those key occupations which require specialized training or education for the correctional field. These fall into the following broad categories.

a. *Management*, including such positions as wardens, sheriffs, administrators of juvenile correctional institutions, community facility managers, heads of probation and parole offices, their principal deputies, and other key managerial personnel.

b. *Correctional officers in adult institutions*, including supervisors, who have the direct responsibility for the custody, security, and safety of residents of correctional institutions.

c. *Child care workers* (often also referred to as houseparents, living unit staff or youth service workers), who have direct responsibility for the supervision or custody of children in a juvenile facility, and who may also have some collateral counseling role.

d. *Probation or parole officers*, who provide direct supervision and support for persons on probation or parole, and who perform related functions, such as pre-sentence investigations and recommendations to parole or classification boards.

In addition to the above line correctional positions, correctional institutions employ a large variety of specialized professional personnel in connection with their responsibilities for the training, rehabilitation, and welfare of their inmates. This group, "treatment and educational specialists," as used in our summary statistics, includes occupations such as teachers, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, physicians, dentists, nurses and allied health professionals, chaplains, librarians, and recreational specialists. Some of these professional personnel, such as physicians or chaplains, clearly require no specialized training to perform in a correctional institution, other than brief orientations. However, others who perform inmate counseling or rehabilitation roles do require more intensive training for the correctional function and environment, as discussed later in this report.

Finally, the large group of "clerical, craft, and other support personnel," includes a variety of administrative, clerical, maintenance, and service positions. With some exceptions, incumbents in these positions also do not normally require specialized preparation for performing in a correctional environment, other than orientation or on-the-job training.

Summary statistics on the distribution of correctional employees among these broad occupational groups are presented in Table II–2. These data are based on separate censuses or surveys conducted in the past few years of each of the major categories of correctional activity. The occupational data from these sources were, in turn, used as a basis for distribution of the full-time equivalent employment reported in 1974, for each category of correctional agency, in the annual Census-LEAA survey of employment in all state and local correctional agencies. Because of differences in timing, and in occupational classification and reporting procedures, the resulting estimates are subject to some margin of error. They are based, however, upon the most comprehensive information currently available for each correctional activity.

Table II–2

Estimated Distribution of Full-Time Equivalent Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities, by Major Occupational Group: 1974

(Full-time equivalents)

Occupational Group	Number	Percent
Total	**203,200**	**100**
Management[a]	14,300	7
Custodial officers, adult facilities	69,500	34
Child care workers	17,800	9
Probation and parole officers[a]	22,500	11
Treatment and educational specialists in adult/juvenile facilities	22,600	11
Clerical, craft and other support personnel	56,500	28

[a] Management group also includes approximately 3,000 probation and parole supervisors.

Sources: NMS estimates by occupational group adapted from occupational distributions of various categories of correctional agencies, primarily from following sources:

LEAA-Census, *Census Survey of State Correctional Facilities, 1974.*

LEAA-Census, *Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities,* 1973 (unpublished data).

LEAA, *The Nation's Jails*, 1975 (based on 1972 jail census).

NMS Executive Survey of Probation and Parole Executives, 1975.

Using these estimates, the line correctional occupations accounted—in combination—for 61 percent of total correctional employment in 1974. Correctional officers and supervisors in adult institutions, the largest single occupational group, accounted for more than one-half of this total and for 34 percent of total correctional employment. Line probation and parole officers were the second largest group, with an estimated employment of 22,500, exclusive of about 3,000 supervisory personnel. About 17,800 additional employees were classified as child-care workers in juvenile institutions or other residential facilities.

The managerial group (including probation and parole supervisors) is estimated at 14,300 or 7 percent of the total. This category includes individuals with widely differing scopes of managerial responsibilities, from administrators of state correctional systems and of large correctional institutions to those supervising local jails, group homes, or probation and parole officers with very small numbers of employees. Many of the latter also typically perform line correctional duties, in addition to their administrative or supervisory responsibilities.

An additional 22,600 employees, or 11 percent of the total, were classified as treatment and educational specialists in adult and juvenile facilities. This group, as described above, is primarily limited to those in specialized professional occupations, and who perform functions such as counseling, rehabilitation, education, medical, and related welfare services. It excludes correctional officers and auxiliary personnel, such as clerical workers and paraprofessionals, who may be assigned to these functions in a supporting role. The latter are included, with all other support and administrative personnel, among employees in the "clerical, crafts, and other support personnel" group, which accounted for 56,500 or 28 percent of total correctional employment in 1974.

Alternative estimates of employment in line correctional occupations were also derived from the Census Employee Characteristics Survey. This was a nationwide sample survey of over 46,000 employees of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, exclusive of courts. Included in the survey questionnaire were a series of questions on the type of work being performed by the respondents, their most important activities or duties, and their job titles. Estimates of employment in the major line correctional occupations, based on these responses, are shown in Table II–3. These differ from those presented in Table II–2 because of differences in sample design, and in occupational classification procedures. To illustrate, under the Employee Characteristics Survey, correctional officers whose assignment involved performance of administrative duties, or supervision of certain institutional support activities, were classified by the NMS in the appropriate administrative or support function, rather than as custodial officers. On the other hand, reports submitted by correctional agencies under recent censuses of correctional activities were more likely to include such personnel as "custodial officers," irrespective of their duty assignments.

As a result of these and other technical differences between the two sets of estimates, the 63,300 classified as custodial officers and supervisors in adult institutions, based on the Employee Characteristics Survey, is about 10 percent less than the corresponding estimate of 69,500 in Table II–2. The estimate for child care workers of 13,100 in the Employee Characteristics Survey, is similarly lower than the estimate of 17,800 derived from a recent (1973) LEAA survey of juvenile agencies. The two estimates for line probation and parole officers, on the other hand, correspond much more closely.

Despite these limitations, the data from the Census Employee Characteristics Survey provide the only comprehensive data on the education and training of correctional personnel. These data have therefore

Table II–3

Estimated Employment of Supervisors and Line Personnel in Selected Correctional Occupations, 1974

(Based on Census Employee Characteristics Survey)

Occupation (NMS Code)	Number
Total custodial officers and supervisors, adult institutions	63,300
State and local institutions, except jails	48,000
Supervisors	2,900
Line personnel	45,100
Sheriffs' jails	15,300
Supervisors	800
Line personnel	14,500
Child care workers[a]	13,100
Supervisors	900
Line personnel	12,300
Probation and parole officers	24,900
Supervisors	2,800
Line personnel	22,100

[a] Based on positions identified as in contact with juvenile offenders only.

Note: Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974. See text for discussion of limitations.

served as the basis for our assessments of the education and training status of correctional officers in Chapters V and VI of this report.

3. *Correctional workload and employment trends.* The rapid escalation of crime rates during the past two decades has been accompanied by sharp increases in the total number of offenders either arrested and convicted of serious crimes if adults, or who have been adjudicated as juvenile delinquents, and who have thus—in either case—normally become subject to some form of correctional control or supervision. Although comprehensive historical data on the flows of offenders through the criminal justice system are not available, Table II–4 provides indicators of "inputs" into correctional control, as measured by estimates of the number of convictions of persons charged with felonies, and of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts; and of the number of offenders actually in custody in state adult or juvenile penal institutions.

The comparisons provide a sharp contrast between the trend of correctional inputs and that of the numbers actually confined in state institutions. In the case of adult offenders, the number convicted increased by about 45 percent between 1969 and 1974. On the other hand, the number of inmates of state institutions showed little net change between 1969 and 1972, then increased in the following two years. Moreover, it continued to grow sharply to a record high of 217,000 in 1975, according to preliminary reports. However, in 1974, the prison inmate population was still only 11 percent above the 1969 level.[1] In the case of juvenile offenders, the number of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts—including "status" offenses, but excluding ordinary traffic cases—rose by 64 percent between 1965 and 1973. Yet over the same period, the number confined in state juvenile institutions remained stable between 1965 and 1970, then dropped sharply in the following three years. In 1974, it was 35 percent lower than in 1965.

One obvious explanation for these contrasting trends has been the increased diversion of both juvenile and adult offenders from institutionalization to probation or other forms of community-based, nonresidential programs. In 1969, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training estimated that a total of 836,000 offenders were under the control of probation/parole agencies, as compared to about 279,000 in adult institutions, jails, or juvenile detention facilities.[2] Although definitive statistics are lacking, there is considerable evidence—developed later in this chapter—that probation/parole caseloads have grown rapidly since then. Several factors contributed to this trend, in our judgment. These include: the high cost of institutionalization, which was estimated to be about 10 times as great, per offender manyear, as community-based nonresidential programs by the President's Commission in its 1967 report;[3] mounting evidence publicized by such studies as the Crime Commission's that imprisonment was no more—and perhaps even less—effective in rehabilitation of offenders than the much less costly community programs; the increase in prison riots in the late 1960's and early 1970's, which served to dramatize the deplorable and inhumane conditions in many institutions, as well as related problems concerned with overcrowding and racial tensions in these institutions; and an apparent increased reluctance on the part of many judges to sentence offenders to prison terms, or to assign them to juvenile institutions, in view of these conditions.

Although the above interpretations are not readily capable of empirical verification, it is clear that imprisonment has increasingly been reserved for the more serious and dangerous offenders. Thus, J. Q. Wilson has noted that the proportion of state prison inmates who had been convicted of homicide, robbery, or assault rose from about one-third of the prison population in 1960 to nearly one-half in 1974, while those convicted of non-violent crimes, such as burglary, larceny, and auto theft, had actually de-

Table II-4

Indicators of Correctional Workloads for Adult and Juvenile Offenders, 1965–1974

(Numbers in thousands)

	Adults				Juveniles			
	Estimated Felons Convicted[a]		Prisoners in State Institutions[b]		Delinquency Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts[c]		Offenders in State Institutions[d]	
	Number	Index*	Number	Index*	Number	Index*	Number	Index*
1965	—	—	189.8	107.6	697.0	70.5	42.4	97.7
1966	—	—	180.4	102.3	745.0	75.4	—	—
1967	—	—	175.3	100.6	811.0	82.0	—	—
1968	387.5	95.6	173.1	98.1	900.0	91.0	—	—
1969	405.2	100.0	176.4	100.0	988.5	100.0	43.4	100.0
1970	450.8	111.3	176.4	100.0	1052.0	106.4	42.2	97.2
1971	486.6	120.1	177.1	100.4	1125.0	113.8	36.8	84.8
1972	492.0	121.4	174.4	98.9	1112.5	112.5	—	—
1973	537.3	132.6	181.4	102.8	1143.7	115.7	28.5	65.7
1974	591.1	145.9	195.8	111.0	—	—	27.4	63.1

[a] *Estimated felony convictions:* Adapted from data in FBI, *Uniform Crime Reports*. Calculated by applying disposition statistics from sample cities to total number of offenses known. Includes both persons found guilty of offenses charged and those found guilty of lesser offenses.

[b] *Prisoners in state institutions:* U.S. Bureau of Prisons, *National Prisoner Statistics*, NPS Bulletins No. 43, August 1968 and No. 47, April 1972, and LEAA, *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions, December 31, 1971, 1972, and 1973*, May 1975. Data for 1960–70 include all sentenced inmates; for 1971–74, include prisoners sentenced to at least a year and a day.

[c] *Delinquent cases disposed of by juvenile courts:* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Offices of Human Development and Youth Development, *Juvenile Court Statistics, 1973*, March 1975.

[d] *Offenders in state institutions:* National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Correction in the United States*, 1966, Table 25 and *Children in Custody*, for the years indicated (1971 data are revised. Data for 1974 are preliminary.)

*1969 = 100.

creased—despite the fact that the reported rate of these crimes had increased more than four times.[4]

Additional confirming evidence is provided by the data on employment trends in various correctional activities during the past decade (Table II–5). Between 1965 and 1974 total correctional employment nearly doubled, rising from about 116,000 in 1965, to nearly 208,000 in 1974. Probation and parole agencies experienced the most rapid growth over this period, increasing their staffs from about 19,000 in 1965, to nearly 50,000 in 1974. Relatively rapid growth was also indicated for local jails and other locally-based facilities. The slowest employment growth, about 41 percent, was experienced by the state correctional institutions for adults and juveniles.

The comparisons cited above describe correctional workload and employment trends to the year 1974, the last year for which comprehensive statistical data were available at the time of this report. However, based on preliminary reports, it is clear that the number of inmates in state adult institutions, which had begun to increase in 1973 and 1974, experienced an even more rapid growth in 1975. (These recent trends and their implications for correctional man-

Table II–5

*Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities: 1965–1974**

	Number		Percent Distribution		Percent Change 1965–1974
	1965	1974	1965	1975	
Total	**115.9**	**207.6**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**87**
State adult institutions	46.7	66.0	40.3	31.8	41
Local jails and other adult facilities	19.2	44.4	16.6	21.4	131
State juvenile institutions	21.2	30.0	18.3	14.5	41
Local juvenile institutions	9.9	17.6	8.5	8.5	78
Probation and parole	18.9	49.6	16.3	23.8	162

Sources: 1965—Based on survey by National Council on Crime and Delinquency, published in *Corrections in the United States, 1966*. Table 25, Probation and parole employment, including court-affiliated agencies, estimated in part based on interpolation of data on probation and parole officers for 1962 and 1967, from the *Probation and Parole Directory, 1976*, NCCD.

1974—LEAA-Census, *Employment and Expenditure Data for Criminal Justice Agencies, 1974*. The distribution of local government by type of activity is partially estimated.

Data in both years refer to total employees, and exclude employees in administrative agencies.

*Includes full-time and part-time workers. Part-time workers not adjusted to full-time equivalents.

power are reviewed in detail in our separate analysis of state adult correctional institutions.)

4. *Current correctional manpower problems.* Despite the substantial growth in correctional manpower during the past decade, reports from field visits conducted in late 1975 and early 1976 by NMS staff to correctional activities in 10 states—as well as much collateral information—indicated that many correctional administrators considered that their agencies' current staffing levels were inadequate in relation to their workloads.[5] One initial approach taken by the NMS in assessing the overall extent and severity of this problem, in its survey of correctional administrators, was to obtain the administrators' own appraisals of their agencies' manpower needs. As a point of departure, respondents were requested to identify in rank order the "most serious" manpower problem in their agencies. The problems listed were:

- Inadequate number of authorized positions
- Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strength
- High (excessive) turnover
- Inadequate training of personnel
- Inadequate representation of minorities or women on staff

With the exception of the administrators of juvenile institutions, a majority of correctional administrators reported that their most serious personnel problem was an inadequate number of authorized positions. Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strength was cited next most frequently by heads of state adult institutions and by sheriffs. Problems related to inadequate numbers of personnel were also cited by nearly one-half (46 percent) of juvenile corrections administrators. The latter, however, placed much more emphasis upon qualitative personnel problems, including those related to inadequate training and high personnel turnover.

As would be expected, when executives were next asked to indicate the major factor contributing to their "most serious" manpower problems, "general budgetary problems" were most frequently reported by all categories of administrators. Nearly one-fifth of juvenile corrections administrators were more specifically concerned with inadequacy of training funds. About 1 out of 10 of all correctional administrators identified inadequate compensation as a major contributing factor.

Despite the inherent limitations of attitudinal questions of this type, the pronounced contrast in patterns of response between heads of juvenile institutions and other categories of correctional administrators appears consistent with our overview of recent trends in correctional workloads and staffing. Juvenile institutions experienced a very substantial reduction in their resident populations between 1965 and 1974, concurrent with a growth in staff employment. It may be assumed that these trends have ameliorated earlier manpower shortages in these institutions, as perceived by their administrators. Hence, the most critical problems in these agencies are more likely to be those resulting from qualitative personnel deficiencies. Other categories of correctional administrators have, however, borne the brunt of the rapid growth of total correctional workloads, and were therefore much more likely to emphasize quantitative personnel shortages.

B. State Correctional Institutions for Adults

1. *Profile of state institutions.* In 1974, a total of 66,000 employees—about one-third of all correctional manpower (on a full-time equivalent basis)—were employed in state operated correctional facilities for adults. These were employed in some 600 administratively separate institutions or facilities, including conventional closed prisons, prison farms, road camps, or forest camps; in community centers; and in classification or medical centers. About 70 percent of the custodial personnel and 63 percent of the prisoners were in the 172 conventional (closed) prisons covered in the 1974 Census of State Correctional facilities.

In 1974, separate institutions for male prisoners were by far the largest component of State adult corrections. Although crime by women was increasing relatively rapidly, separately administered prisons for females employed only 4 percent of the total, and combined institutions holding some combination of men, women, and/or children accounted for only 9 percent.

In most states, persons sentenced to confinement as a result of serious crimes, i.e., felonies, are sent to state correctional institutions such as prisons, and persons convicted of less serious offenses, i.e., misdemeanors, are sent to local jails. Nearly 40 percent of inmates of state adult institutions were housed in facilities classified as maximum security. Although the bulk of these prisoners were in conventional closed prisons, large shares of those in prison farms and in classification or medical centers were also in maximum security centers, while inmates in

Table II–6

Responses by Correctional Administrators and Sheriffs on "Most Serious Manpower Problem" and on "Major Factor Contributing to Most Serious Problem"

	Agency Category			
	State Adult Institution	Juvenile Institution	Sheriffs[a]	Probation and Parole
MOST SERIOUS MANPOWER PROBLEM				
Inadequate number of authorized positions	52.2	38.5	68.0	53.9
Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strength	13.8	10.1	13.3	10.0
High (excessive) turnover	9.5	12.6	4.4	6.5
Inadequate training of personnel	13.4	31.9	7.3	19.0
Inadequate representation of minorities or women	6.0	4.7	2.8	4.6
Other	5.2	4.9	4.1	6.0
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
MAJOR CONTRIBUTING FACTOR				
General budgetary problems	63.6	42.6	71.8	59.9
General lack of qualified applicants	8.1	7.3	2.9	2.4
Lack of minority or female applicants	2.5	2.8	1.8	1.2
Inadequate levels of compensation	8.1	12.6	11.7	10.7
Insufficient funds for training	8.6	18.5	3.3	11.0
Limited opportunities for advancement	4.0	5.7	1.8	3.8
Other	5.1	10.5	6.6	11.8
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

[a] In agencies with 10 or more employees.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

forest and road camps were usually under minimum security.

An extensive list of services was reported to be provided to inmates by most state adult correctional facilities, and especially by closed prisons. Ninety percent or more of the closed prisons reported to the 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities that they offered individual counseling, remedial education, assessment of vocational potential, vocational training, and religious services, and had a library, an athletic field, and a sick bay. Additional services such as a college degree program, job placement assistance, and drug and alcoholic treatment were also offered by high proportions of the facilities. Of course, the fact that a service was reported to be available by itself tells very little of the extent of its use or its quality.

2. *Trends in inmate population.* Statistics on the number of inmates in state adult correctional institutions are available, in a consistent series, for a period of three decades to 1970, and—on a slightly different basis—for the years 1971–75. Despite some differences in coverage, the overall trend is quite clear. As shown in Table II–8, the total number of inmates rose sharply during the 1950's, from 149,000 in 1950 to 190,000 in 1960, but then declined to 178,000 in 1970. During the 1950's, the growth in imprisonment was more rapid than population growth and the per capita imprisonment rate rose from 99 per 100,000 population to 106 per 100,000 in 1960. During the 1960's, however, despite the sharp increase in crime rates, the per capita rate fell to 88 per 100,000 in 1970, with substantial reductions reported in each region of the country.

Table II–7

Institutions, Inmates and Custodial Personnel in State Adult Correctional Facilities, by Type of Institution, 1974[a]

Type of Institutions	Institutions	Inmates	Custodial Personnel
All institutions	**592**	**187,982**	**37,929**
Classification or medical centers	33	9,766	2,523
Community centers	158	8,975	1,131
All prisons	401	169,241	34,545
Prison farms	41	25,402	3,247
Road camps	80	6,369	1,277
Forest camps	41	2,483	329
Closed prisons	172	118,708	26,357
Other prisons	67	16,279	3,335

[a] Excludes Massachusetts and two small facilities in Georgia.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974, Advance Report*, July 1975, pp. 6 and 20.

This pattern was dramatically reversed in the past several years. The number of inmates remained relatively stable between 1970 and 1972, after allowing for minor differences in the statistical series, but then rose sharply from 174,000 in 1972 to a record level of 217,000 in 1975, according to preliminary estimates. Inmate populations rose in all regions, but most rapidly in the South. Thus, over one-half, 23,000, of the net growth of 43,000 in inmate populations between 1972 and 1975 was reported in the Southern states, in contrast to relatively small net increases in the Northeast and West, of 6,000 and 4,000. As a result of these differential trends, the per capita rate of incarceration in the South—which has been consistently higher than the national average—rose to 152 per 100,000 in 1975, as compared with the national average of 102 per 100,000 and with 69 per 100,000 in the Northeastern region.

The factors which resulted in the decline in prisoner population during the 1960's have been discussed in the preceding section. Although the factors contributing to the sharp growth since 1972 cannot fully be diagnosed on the basis of available data, a significant portion of this increase can be attributed to recent shifts in the age composition of the population. As shown in Table II–9, the inmate population includes a relatively high concentration of younger adults in the age groups 20–34 years. These age groups, particularly those in the 25–34 year group, which includes the post-World War II "baby boom" generation, have experienced the most rapid growth during the first half of the present decade. By applying the ratio of inmates per population in each age group to the actual population distributions in 1971 and 1975, we estimate that of the net growth of 40,000 inmates between these years, about 17,000, or 42.5 percent, can be attributed to changes in population size and composition. In other words, the same population wave which contributed to the rapid growth in juvenile delinquency and in overall crime rates during the 1960's is now significantly contributing to the growth in prison populations.

This demographic factor, however, provides only a partial explanation for the recent prison population

Table II–8

Inmates in State Adult Correctional Facilities, by Region, Selected Years: 1950–1975

End of Year	U.S. Total	Northeast	North Central	South	West
		Number in Thousands			
All Sentenced Inmates:					
1950	149	32	42	54	20
1960	190	34	50	72	34
1967	175	29	42	64	40
1970[a]	178	29	42	71	36
Inmates Sentenced to at Least a Year and a Day:					
1971	177	28	42	79	29
1972	174	28	38	81	28
1973	181	30	36	84	31
1974	196	31	40	90	35
1975[b]	217	34	47	104	32
		INMATES PER 100,000 POPULATION			
All Sentenced Inmates:					
1950	99	80	98	113	103
1960	106	76	97	130	120
1967	89	61	75	105	122
1970	88	59	74	113	105
Inmates Sentenced to at Least a Year and a Day:					
1971	86	56	73	123	81
1972	84	57	65	124	78
1973	86	60	63	128	85
1974	93	63	69	134	93
1975	102	69	82	152	85

Sources: Number of inmates, 1950 through 1970 from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, NPS Bulletin, Number 47, *National Prisoner Statistics*, April 1972, Tables 1 and 6. Estimates were made for a few states which did not report in 1970.

Number of inmates 1971–74 from U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on Dec. 31, 1974*, June 1976, Table 1.

Inmate estimate for December 31, 1975, based on percentage changes by region in 1975, reported by *Corrections Magazine*, March 1976.

Population data from the *Statistical Abstract* for 1975, p. 12.

growth. It does not explain the sharp contrast between the declining trend in prison population during the 1960's (when population was growing in nearly all age groups) and the recent reversal of this trend, even after full allowance for changes in population structure. We must infer that this reversal reflects a significant shift in public policies and in state laws, requiring increased emphasis on imprisonment, particularly in the case of repeat offenders and those guilty of violent crimes. A recent study for the Southern Governors' Conference cited the following reasons for the growing prison populations in the 18 Southern states:

> (1) Increases in the rate of crime; (2) increased court commitments; (3) current problems in the economy such as unemployment and inflation . . . [and] . . . tendencies for the courts to impose longer sentences, improved law enforcement capabilities and lack of "diversion" programs and facilities at the community level.[6]

One of the results of the growth in prisoner population has been a severe overcrowding of prisoners in many institutions. Reporting on existing conditions in some of these prisons, in early 1976, *Corrections Magazine* noted that, "in different states, prisoners have been forced to sleep on floors, in shower rooms, and on ledges above toilets. Others live in unsupervised dormitories, or fit themselves by two, threes, and fours into cells built for one. While overcrowding is not a new problem, some states report that the current situation is worse than ever before."[7] On the grounds that such conditions represent "cruel and unusual punishment," federal courts in at least five states had ordered state officials to take necessary action to remedy these conditions and—in some cases—prisons were forced to impose a moratorium on acceptance of new prisoners.[8]

Since prison overcrowding may be accompanied by problems of inadequate prison staffing, administrators of correctional institutions responding to the NMS were requested to provide data on inmate populations, in relation to the designed capacity of their facilities. The results, based on reports for 144 conventional prisons, are shown in Table II–10. Of the total respondents, 35 percent reported that their average inmate population, for fiscal year 1975, exceeded the designed capacity of their facilities by 5 percent or more, and 15 percent reported overcrowding of 35 percent or more. The problem appears to have been most severe in the case of the smaller facilities, those with less than 100 inmate capacity. Of 26 reporting facilities in this category, one-half indicated overcrowding of 15 percent or more.

3. *Personnel requirements.* In its review of correctional activities in the mid-1960's, the Task Force on Corrections of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice found major shortages of correctional staffs in all functional categories, with particularly severe deficits of specialized treatment personnel.[9]

Table II–9

Inmate Ratios per 100,000 Population per Age Group, 1974, and Percent Changes in Population by Age Group, 1970–75

Age Group	Inmates of State Correctional Facilities Per 100,000 Population, 1974	Percent Change in U.S. Population, 1970–75
18–19	166	11.6
20–24	311	11.9
25–29	288	23.3
30–34	209	20.8
35–39	145	4.2
40–49	83	−4.8
50 years and over	20	6.4

Sources: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities, 1974*, 1976, Table 1.

Population data refer to July 1, 1974. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates and Projections, Series P–25, No. 519, Table 1, April 1974 and P–25, No. 541, February 1975.

Table II–10

Percent Distribution of Conventional Prisons by Relation of Inmate Population to Designed Capacity and by Size, 1975

Inmate Population as Percent of Designed Capacity	Inmate Capacities			
	All Prisons	500 or More	100 to 499	Less than 100
Number of reports	(144)	(65	(53)	(26)
Percent Distribution:				
Less than 85 percent	32	25	40	35
85 to 94	17	18	21	8
95 to 104	16	26	8	8
105 to 114	6	8	8	0
115 to 134	14	15	13	12
135 or more	15	8	11	38
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

*Detail may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Source: NMS Survey Executive Surveys, 1975.

A comparison of employment in state correctional facilities, by functional group, is available for the years 1962 and 1974. As shown in Table II–11, there have been significant increases in staffing over this 12-year period. The number of educational and treatment personnel (including medical) rose by more than 100 percent over this period, as compared with an increase of 42 percent for custodial officers. Since the inmate population was approximately the same in both of these years,[10] this would suggest some significant improvement in the adequacy of personnel staffing.

Table II–11

Employment in State Correctional Facilities for Adults, by Occupation Group, 1962 and 1974[a]

Occupational Group	Number 1962	Number 1974	Percent Change
Total	**42,721**	**60,604**	**+42**
Warden and assistant wardens	749	1,141	+52
Custodial personnel	26,966	38,157	+42
Treatment and educational specialists	3,061	6,319	+106
Teachers	1,457	2,851	+96
Social workers	525	1,341	+155
Psychologists	158	365	+131
Psychiatrists	96	181	+89
Doctors	517	614	+19
Nurses	308	967	+214
Other	11,945	14,987	+25

[a] Excludes data for Massachusetts for both years.

Source: Data for 1962 from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, *National Prisoner Statistics*, Number 35, Personnel 1972, October 1974, pp. 5, 10 and 11. Data for 1974 from special tabulation based on the U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974*, June 1975.

For purposes of assessing current adequacy of staffing in these institutions, two sets of criteria were used. Correctional administrators were requested to provide estimates of the number of personnel needed for effective performance of their agencies' functions, which were compared to their actual employment. In addition, the actual staffing ratios to inmate population for custodial officers and treatment personnel in these institutions were compared to standards recommended as desirable by various expert groups or Commission studies during the past decade.

A more objective, empirically-based set of criteria for this assessment would have been desirable, which would relate the effects of different levels of staffing, by function, to measures of correctional performance, e.g., changes in recidivism or reductions in prison tension. Despite the very considerable literature on the issue of correctional effectiveness, the detailed empirical data needed for a systematic assessment of this type is still not available.

4. *Executive assessments of personnel needs.* The first approach in assessing current personnel requirements for correctional activities was to ask administrators for their judgments of their personnel needs. To provide some perspective for interpreting these judgments, executives were also requested to identify the most important goals for their agencies.

Rehabilitation has traditionally been considered the principal goal of the correctional process. Thus, in a survey of correctional staffs conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in 1967, 75 percent of those in adult institutions responded that this goal should receive primary emphasis.[11] In recent years, increasing skepticism has developed concerning the efficacy of the traditional "treatment" approach in a prison setting. Some observers have contended that such activities as prison training, counseling or therapy activities are often participated in by prisoners simply as a means of securing an early parole, and should be offered only if the prisoner has the motivation to seek them out, because of his own desire for self-understanding and self-improvement. The further argument is made that the practical goals for most prisons are simply the secure custody and humane management of offenders.[12]

The NMS survey of 1975 found that heads of state adult correctional facilities were divided on this issue. When asked about goals for their agencies, only about 40 percent considered prisoner rehabilitation, or some component, as most important, with the other 60 percent viewing good incarceration management as their most important goal (Table II–12). Although the wording of this question was somewhat different from that of the earlier (1967) survey, the results do suggest an increased emphasis on incarceration management by administrators of state prisons.

The focus on incarceration management as the primary goal increased with the size of the correctional facility, and as expected was greater for executives of conventional prisons than for other types of institutions. Almost three-fourths of the executives of facilities with 400 or more employees reported that inmate maintenance, or a low level of conflict, was their most important goal; while in the smallest size groups, over 60 percent reported that one or more of the prisoner treatment options were most important (Table II–13). The division among prison administrators on their most important goals

Table II–12

Distribution of Executives' Views of the Most Important Goals for Their Agency, State Adult Correctional Facilities, 1975

Most Important Goals	Percent of Replies
Total	**100**
Effective incarceration management, total	**60**
Inmate maintenance—adequate housing, food, medical care	52
A low level of conflict in the facility	8
Offender treatment or rehabilitation, total	**40**
Rehabiliation of offenders	26
Effective counseling of inmates	8
Vocational training	4
Job placement of released offenders	2

Source: NMS survey of Executives of State Adult Corrections Institutions, 1975. Based on 226 replies.

Table II–13

Responses by Executives on "Most Important Goal," by Size and Type of Facility, State Adult Corrections, 1975

Size of Agency	Most Important Goal: Incarceration Management	Most Important Goal: Offender Treatment or Rehabilitation
All Facilities:	Percent of All Replies	
400 employees or more	73	26
150–399	64	36
75–149	55	45
25–74	53	47
1–24	38	62
Total	**60**	**40**
Conventional Prisons:		
400 employees or more	77	23
150–399	76	24
75–149	58	42
25–74	52	48
1–24	50	50
Total	**66**	**34**

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

undoubtedly reflects significant differences in emphasis on the treatment function that exist among the nation's prisons, often including differences among prisons within individual states.

Although a majority of the executives of state adult correctional facilities identified some element of good incarceration management as their primary goal, the respondents clearly were more satisfied with the relative sufficiency of their custodial force than they were with the number of treatment specialists—defined, in this context, as psychiatrists, social workers, and counselors. As shown in Table II–12, these administrators estimated that an increase of 20 percent in their total staffs was needed to effectively fulfill all the duties and responsibilities of their agencies. However, they reported a need for an increase of 42 percent in treatment specialists, as compared to 14 percent for custodial officers. In terms of aggregate numbers, these estimates correspond to a requirement for an additional 14,000 employees in these institutions. Since custodial officers comprised 64 percent of total employment in state adult institutions, this would imply an increase of 6,200 custodial officers, as compared to only about 900 for the designated treatment specialists, who made up only 3 percent of their total work force in 1975.

Administrators of smaller facilities reported much greater needs for additional personnel than those in larger facilities. Heads of facilities with less than 25 employees indicated an average required increase in staff of 53 percent, as compared with 16 percent among those with 150 or more employees. This pattern is consistent with that observed in responses to this question by other categories of criminal justice executive, and also correlates with the evidence of more severe overcrowding in smaller facilities cited above. However, administrators of facilities in all size groups consistently reported much greater relative needs for treatment specialists than for custodial officers.

Correctional administrators were further queried on expected employment changes in their facilities between June 1975 and June 1976. Despite the budgetary difficulties experienced by many state governments during this period, these administrators projected a median increase of 5 percent in total employment, with a somewhat greater increase of 8 percent for treatment specialists—a pattern clearly consistent with their perceptions of relative manpower needs.

5. *Inmate-Staff ratios.* Management assessments of the number of staff personnel needed to properly perform various correctional functions must normally take into account a large number of variables: the characteristics and needs of their inmate population; the level of security required; the types of work, training, or rehabilitation programs provided; the physical layout of the facility; scheduled work hours, shift arrangements and leave provisions; and many

Table II–14

Percent Change in Staffing Reported as Necessary for Effective Performance in State Adult Correctional Facilities, by Size and Type of Facility, 1975

Size of Agency	Median Percent Increase in Employment Needed		
	Total Employment	Correctional Officers	Treatment Personnel
All Correctional Facilities:			
150 or more employees	16	12	38
75–149	24	15	47
25–74	31	25	82
1–24	53	32	65
Weighted median	20	14	42
Conventional Prisons:			
150 or more employees	14	11	34
75–149	27	16	61
25–74	28	22	86
1–24	61	40	100
Weighted median	16	12	38

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Based on 201 reports, including 142 from administrators of conventional prisons.

others. These vary from facility to facility, and will also depend—in considerable measure—on perceived management goals and priorities. As general guides, various Commissions or professional groups have developed certain standards or statistical norms for use in assessing correctional manpower staffing requirements. These "professional judgment" standards, in turn, have been used as criteria for comparison with actual staffing ratios of custodial officers and specified treatment specialists.

For custodial officers, the 1967 report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice adopted—as a rough guide—a ratio of 1 officer for every 6 inmates, based on its judgment that the average ratio which it found, of 1 custodial officer for 7.7 inmates was insufficient to support desirable programs, such as inmate counseling, training, and recreation. These all impose a requirement for additional custodial officers, as compared to conditions confining prisoners mainly to their cells.[13]

An analysis of available statistics indicates that there was a substantial long-term improvement in this ratio between the early 1960's and 1974. These data indicate a reduction in the inmate-custodial officer ratio for all state adult facilities, from 8.2 inmates per officer in 1960 to 5.0 in 1974 for all facilities, and to 4.5 for conventional prisons. This trend appears to have been reversed in 1975, however, based on NMS reports. As a result of the sharp increase in inmate population, the ratio rose from 4.5 to 5.2 inmates per officer for conventional prisons between January 1974 and June 1975.

A more detailed analysis of custodial officer staffing ratios for individual facilities, based on data from the 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities, indicates that at that time 60 percent of all facilities met or exceeded the ratio of 1 custodial officer per 6 inmates. The percentage of facilities meeting this standard was highest in the Northeast and North Central states (80 percent and 66 percent, respectively). It was lowest in the South (53 percent) and in the West (54 percent).

In view of the increase in prison population and in prison overcrowding between 1974 and 1975, a special analysis of the NMS results was compiled to determine the relationship between overcrowding and staffing ratios in conventional problems. The analysis, based on reports for 129 state prisons, indicates that in each security category those prisons whose inmate populations exceeded their designed capacity also reported substantially higher ratios of inmates per custodial officer than did prisons which were not overcrowded.

The above statistics refer to inmate population and staffing levels as of June 1975. Available press reports, cited earlier, suggest a continued increase in inmate populations in the following year, and related pressures upon staff and facilities. These were reflected in the responses of correctional administrators, in NMS field visits to 10 states conducted in late 1975 and early 1976. These administrators observed that the recent acceleration in growth of

Table II–15

Ratios of Inmates to Custodial Officers in State Adult Correctional Facilities: Selected Years, 1960–1975

Year	Inmates Per Custodial Officer	
	All Facilities	Conventional Prisons
1960 (December 31)	8.2	—
1961 (December 31)	7.8	--
1962 (December 31)	7.5	—
1974 (January 31)	5.0	4.5
1975 (June 30)	—	5.2

Sources: Data for 1960-62 are from National Prisoner Statistics, Number 35, p. 5. Data for 1974 are from the *Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974, Advance Report*, July 1975, pp. 6 and 20. Data for 1975 are from the NMS Survey of executives of state adult correctional facilities.

Table II–16

Ratio of Inmates to Custodial Officers in Conventional State Prisons, by Type of Security and Whether Prison was Overcrowded, 1975

Type of Security	Ratio of Inmates to Custodial Officers			
	Overcrowded		Not Overcrowded	
	Ratios	Number of Reports	Ratios	Number of Reports
Minimum	5.9 to 1	(11)	4.2 to 1	(20)
Medium	5.7 to 1	(22)	4.3 to 1	(24)
Maximum	5.8 to 1	(16)	3.4 to 1	(14)
Combination or other security	6.5 to 1	(11)	4.8 to 1	(11)
Total	5.9 to 1	(60)	4.0 to 1	(69)

*Overcrowded prisons are all those that had more inmates than designed capacity.
Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

inmate populations had increased the shortage of correctional officers in basic line custodial positions. The following factors were also cited as important in contributing to these shortages.

- Increased transportation requirements, particularly trips to court for continuing inmate cases, appeals, post-correction remedies, etc. In addition, some institutions were using work or education/release programs which required substantial amounts of transportation arrangement on a daily basis.
- Increased use of furlough and/or community release activities, which often required correctional officers to handle not only the routine but also specific administrative matters required for effective management.
- Increased emphasis on volunteer programs and activities which require custodial supervision.
- Court decisions which require additional visiting privileges, custodial representation on hearing boards, and other personnel requirements to meet emerging due process guidelines issued by both state and federal courts.

In view of the increase in custodial officer workloads, it appears likely that the standard caseload considered reasonable by the President's Commission in 1967 may well be inadequate at the present time.

In the case of treatment staffs, the standards used for our assessment were based on those proposed by the American Correctional Association in its 1966 *Manual of Correctional Standards*. Based on data from the 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities, an analysis has been made of the percentage of state prison systems which met three of these standards, i.e., those for social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists. This comparison overstates, to some extent, the proportion of systems meeting specified standards, since the standards used were those recommended for the general prison population, without allowance for higher professional staffing needs for pilot programs, for inmates in specialized services, or for the seriously disturbed or psychotic. Nevertheless, of the 49 states for which data were available, only half met the basic standard recommended for social workers, only 28 percent met that for psychiatrists, and 10 percent that for psychologists (Table II–17). In the latter fields, moreover, a necessarily arbitrary assumption was made that part-time staff were employed for about one-half of the working week.

The adequacy of treatment staffs, based on these comparisons, varied widely by region, with the Southern states consistently reporting the lowest staffing ratios.

Additional comparisons of treatment staff ratios have been made based on responses to the NMS-requested employment data for treatment workers defined as "psychiatrists, social workers, and counselors." This group is considered approximately equivalent to six specialist categories for which separate standards were recommended by the ACA. On a combined basis, these corresponded to a combined standard of one treatment specialist for every 43 "normal" inmates. Based on this standard, 46 percent of the 120 prisons reporting this information met this composite standard (Table II-18). The percentage was much lower—15 percent—for the large prisons with 400 or more employees, which account for a major proportion of all correctional employees, and more favorable (over 60 percent) in the case of prisons with less than 150 employees. Based on these data, we have estimated that—for all reporting prisons—the number of inmates per full-time equivalent treatment specialist was 57 to 1, or about one-third higher than the ACA standard. It should be emphasized, moreover, that in addition to other limitations, it is likely that many employees included as "counselors" or in similar treatment functions in these agency reports probably do not possess the minimal professional qualifications of the ACA standards.

It is clear, from the above comparisons, that a majority of state prisons are not staffed with "treatment" specialists at the levels recommended in the 1966 *Manual of Correctional Standards*. In assessing

Table II–17

Percent of States Meeting Recommended Staffing Standards for Selected Types of Specialists in State Adult Correctional Facilities, by Region, 1974

Occupation	ACA Standard	Percent of States Meeting Standard				
		U.S.	Northeast	North Central	South	West
Social worker	1 per 150 inmates 1 per 30 intakes per month	50	50	67	12	77
Psychologist	1 per 200 inmates	10	12	8	0	15
Psychiatrist	1 per 600 inmates	28	38	25	6	46
Number of states		(49)	(8)	(12)	(16)	(13)
Number of institutions		(592)	(86)	(107)	(301)	(98)

Note: In calculating staffing ratios for psychiatrists and psychologists it was assumed that 2 part-time workers equal 1 full-time worker. For social workers the ratio used was derived from the overall relation of full-time equivalent workers to full-time and part-time workers for all workers in State adult corrections developed from data in *Expenditures and Employment in the Criminal Justice System, 1974.*

Sources: Recommended employment ratios from *Manual of Correctional Standards 3rd Edition*, pp. 424–426. Data on states meeting the standards from a special tabulation of the *Census of State Correctional Facilities*, 1974.

Table II–18

Distribution of Conventional Prisons by Number of Inmates per Treatment Worker, and by Size, 1975

Inmates per Treatment Worker	Size—Total Employment				
	All Size Groups	400 or More	150 to 399	75 to 149	1 to 74
Number of reports	(120)	(19)	(45)	(24)	(32)
Percent Distributions:					
1–20	18	5	7	12	47
20.1–40	24	6	24	46	19
40.1–60	25	26	38	25	6
60.1–80	8	21	9	8	0
80.1–150	17	42	13	0	19
150.1 or more	8	0	9	8	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Percent of prisons with 43 or fewer inmates per treatment worker	46	15	37	62	67

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

the implications of these lower staffing levels for correctional effectiveness, consideration should be given to the effectiveness of current treatment practices in reducing recidivism. In the Spring 1974 issue of *Public Interest,* Robert Martinson, in reviewing the results of 231 studies of treatment programs, concluded that "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism."[15] Responses to this criticism have held, however, that this generalization is not consistent with the more detailed review of results of specific programs, and that particular treatment procedures have produced significant positive results for specific client groups.[16]

It should be emphasized, moreover, that many of the services provided by specialized professional staffs are considered essential by correctional administrators, even when viewed solely in terms of the goals of humane treatment of inmates and reduction of prison tensions, quite apart from their potential for rehabilitation. This is confirmed, moreover, by recent employment trends and projections, and by the administrators' assessments of manpower needs—all of which point to a strong awareness of the need to correct existing severe shortages of treatment and allied staff specialists.

C. Local Jails

A jail is defined as a locally administered institution that has authority to retain adults for 48 hours or longer.[17] Jails serve as detention facilities for persons charged with a crime but not yet adjudicated, and as a correctional facility for persons serving a sentence. Most of the 3,900 local jails are administered by the approximately 3,000 county sheriff agencies, by other county officials, or by municipal police departments.

In mid-1972 local jails held 142,000 inmates, down from the 161,000 held in 1970.[18] Many more offenders or suspected offenders "go to jail" than to state prisons because jails are used for detention of suspected offenders and for confinement of those found guilty of less serious crimes and serving short sentences. Thus, jails have a relatively high turnover of sentenced offenders. More than half of the inmates enumerated in the 1970 jail census were detainees awaiting trial or arraignment (51.7 percent of total). Most of those held as prisoners were serving sentences of one year or less, and as shown below in Table II–19, relatively few inmates (6.5 percent of total) were serving sentences of more than one year. (About 94 percent of those in state institutions are serving sentences of more than one year.) About 5 percent of all jail inmates were juveniles; another 5 percent were female adults.[10] Many of the juveniles were not charged with a crime but were PINS (persons in need of supervision), held in jail because other detention facilities were not available.

About 3 out of 4 of the 3,921 jails enumerated in the 1972 jail census were small, with accommodations for no more than 20 inmates, but over 100 could house 250 or more inmates. The latter accounted for over one-third of the total jail employees.

Services and amenities provided by jails range from little beyond cells and beds, in many jails, to some with all the services of a large prison. For example, in about 30 percent of the jails, meals must be brought in from outside. On the other hand, many jails, especially larger ones, list a wide range of services or programs, as illustrated in Table II–20. Although current data are not available on the quality and comprehensiveness of the services, they are generally considered to be limited in most jails.

Table II–19

Inmate Population of Jails by Type of Detention, March 1970

Type of Retention	Number (in thousands)	Percent of Total
All inmates	**160.9**	**100.0**
Persons not yet arraigned or held for other authorities	17.5	17.1
Persons arraigned and awaiting trial	55.6	34.6
Convicted persons awaiting further legal action	8.7	5.4
Persons serving sentences of 1 year or less	58.6	36.4
Persons serving sentences of more than 1 year	10.5	6.5

Source: *National Jail Census, 1970*, LEAA, 1971, Table 2.

Size of Jail	Number	Employment* 1972
1–20 inmates	2,901	12,127
21–249 inmates	907	15,837
250 or more inmates	113	16,334
Total	3,921	44,298

*Full-time and part-time.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *The Nation's Jails* (a report on the census of jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails), May 1975, Tables 1 and 12, pp. 30 and 34.

Table II–20

Percent of Jails Offering Selected Services to Inmates, by Size of Jail, 1975

Service	Number of Inmates		
	1–20	21–249	250 or more
Work-release program	41	48	43
Weekend sentence program	43	55	59
Separate detention for pre-trial inmates	32	44	58
Federally funded rehabilitative services	6	26	51
Non-federally funded rehabilitative services	59	90	96
Non-federally funded vocational training programs	4	13	34
Doctors on staff*	10	38	84

*The majority of jails with doctors have their services only part-time.

Source: *The Nation's Jails*, 1972.

1. *Crowding in jails.* County jails were much less likely to be overcrowded than state prisons, based on reports by sheriffs to the NMS survey. Only 6 percent reported that their average daily population in fiscal 1975 was 5 percent or more above capacity (Table II–21). This was similar to conditions reported by the 1970 Jail Census, which found that only 5 percent of U.S. jails contained more inmates than they were designed to hold.[20] Overcrowding was somewhat more prevalent for large jails in 1975. Fourteen percent with designed capacity of 250 inmates or more were overcrowded, indicating that jail overcrowding was a more frequent problem in the more heavily populated counties and cities.

Recent newspaper reports suggest that overcrowding in jails has become a more severe problem in 1976. Severe strains in some state prisons have resulted in a backup of prisoners in local jails awaiting transfer to state facilities, and some states were "renting" jail space to accommodate state prison overflows.[21]

2. *Jail Employees*. The most recent comprehensive statistics on employment in jails are based on the 1972 Census of Jails. At that time, a total of about 44,300 employees were employed in jails, including 39,600 full-time personnel and 4,700 part-time employees.[22]

Table II–21

Distribution of Sheriffs' Jails by Relation of Number of Inmates to Designed Capacity and by Size, 1975

Relation of Number of Inmates to Designed Capacity	Size (Designed Inmate Capacities)					
	All Jails	250 or more	100–249	50–99	10–49	1–9
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
85 percent or less	85	58	68	84	95	93
85–95	5	12	13	8	1	0
95–104	4	15	11	3	1	0
105–114	3	10	5	0	1	0
115–134	1	4	1	2	0	0
135 or more	2	0	1	2	2	7
Number of reports	480	48	76	89	238	29

Note: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.
Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

About three-fourths of all jail employees in 1972 were in line correctional officer positions, including guards, jail supervisors, and those in other line managerial positions (Table II–22). An additional 20 percent consisted of support personnel. Medical staffs accounted for only about 4 percent of the total, and—of these—nearly one-half were employed on a part-time basis only. The overall proportion of treatment specialists and teachers in jails was only about 3 percent, of whom over two-fifths were employed on a part-time basis only. The very small components of treatment personnel, as compared with the proportions in state prisons, are attributable—in part—to the small size of many jails and to the short average period of confinement.

The relatively few professional treatment specialists are employed primarily in the larger jails. Of 3,176 employed as teachers, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, doctors, or nurses, 42 percent of the total and 57 percent of all full-time workers were in the 113 jails with 250 or more inmates. Only 20 percent of the total and 14 percent of the full-time professional employed were in the 2,901 jails with 20 or fewer inmates (see Table II–23).

Statistics on jail employment trends since 1972 are not available, on a comparable basis. However, data on employment in county institutions for adult corrections, which accounted for over 40 percent of total jail employees in 1972, indicate a growth of 18 percent, from 17,033 full-time equivalent employees in 1972, to 20,170 in 1974.[23]

3. *Jail manpower needs.* Since most local jails are operated by sheriffs' offices or by other multi-purpose agencies, a separate assessment of manpower needs for jail personnel was not practicable through the NMS executive survey questionnaires. As reported elsewhere in this report, sheriffs did report a relatively high overall requirement for additional personnel (34 percent). However, since only about one-fourth of deputy sheriffs are assigned primarily to custodial duties, it is not possible to infer the extent of manpower shortage for this particular function from the responses.

Comparisons with recommended standards for both the custodial and treatment functions do, however, indicate significant staffing deficiencies, particularly for various categories of treatment personnel. As compared to a proposed standard of 1 custodial officer per 6 jail inmates, recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, the actual ratio in 1972 was 1 custodial employee to 7.2 inmates. This compares with the ratio of 1 custodial officer for each 9 inmates reported by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in its 1965 survey.

The most serious deficiency, however, was the absence of any significant treatment or training function in most jails. To illustrate, the *Task Force Report on Corrections*, prepared by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, had recommended a ratio of 1 casework counselor for every 30 jail inmates.[24]

Table II–22

Employment by Occupational Group in Local Jails, 1975

Occupational Group	Total Employment		Full-Time	Part-Time
	Number	Percent		
Total	**44,298**	**100.0**	**39,627**	**4,671**
Correctional officers, including jail supervisors, and line custodial officers	32,445	73.2	30,315	2,129
Treatment specialists, (social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists)	790	1.8	435	355
Teachers	576	1.3	321	255
Medical staff (doctors and nurses)	1,810	4.1	958	852
Other (clerical and support services)	8,678	19.6	7,598	1,081

Source: *The Nation's Jails, 1972*, May 1975, *op. cit.*

Table II–23

Distribution of Selected Professional Employees in Jails, by Size of Jail, 1972*

Occupational Group	Size of Jail							
	All Jails		Fewer than 21 Inmates		21–249 Inmates		250 or More Inmates	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
All Selected Groups:								
Total	**3,176**	**100**	**645**	**20**	**1,201**	**38**	**1,330**	**42**
Full-time	1,714	100	240	14	498	29	975	57
Part-time	1,462	100	405	28	703	48	355	24

*Includes academic teachers, vocational teachers, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, doctors, and nurses.
Source: Census of Jails, 1972, Table 12.

Statistics for 1972 indicated that this goal is a distant one. In that year, the total number of professional treatment specialists, social workers, and psychologists (who perform such functions), averaged 1 for every 227 inmates. Only 62 percent of these were full-time personnel, corresponding to a ratio of 1 full-time counselor for every 363 inmates.[25] However, even this ratio is an improvement over that reported by NCCD for 1965, which then found 706 inmates per counselor.[26]

D. Juvenile Corrections

Juveniles may come under correctional control because of commission of offenses for which adults are also subject to prosecution, or because of commission of a juvenile or "status" offense, such as truancy, curfew violation, or consumption of alcoholic beverages, or because their parents have found them to be uncontrollable. Also included in the population of juveniles in custody are some nondelinquent children who have been abandoned or neglected and for whom no other public accommodations are available. The maximum age for treatment as a juvenile is 17 years in most states; it is as low as 15 or 16 in a few states.

State and local governments operate a variety of juvenile residential correctional facilities, ranging from detention centers and juvenile shelters—which are designed for short-term custody pending court disposition or placement—to training schools, state ranches, camps and farms, and halfway houses or group homes, which are designed for longer-term custody of adjudicated delinquents.

On June 30, 1974, a total of nearly 45,000 juveniles were being held in custody in 829 separate facilities (Table II–24). About two-thirds of these, nearly 30,000, were in state-operated facilities, mainly in training schools, and in rural-based ranches, forestry camps and farms. Local governments are primarily responsible for operation of the short-term detention centers, which accounted for nearly 10,000 of the total 15,000 under custody in locally-operated residential facilities. Both state and local agencies in some states also operate community-based halfway houses and group homes. However, most of the latter facilities—as well as foster home arrangements—are privately operated under contract with the state or local correctional agencies.

1. *Recent trends in juvenile residential population and in staff employment.* Earlier statistics for state juvenile institutions, cited in Table II–4, although not strictly comparable, suggest that the population in these institutions had remained fairly stable at about 42,000 to 43,000 between 1965 and 1970, but then began to decline in 1971. LEAA/Census data indicate a particularly sharp reduction in the number of juveniles in custody in residential facilities between 1971 and 1974. The residential population of all juvenile facilities declined from 54,700 to 44,900, or by 18 percent, over this three year period. Most of this reduction was in the state training schools, whose resident population fell by nearly 9,000, or 25 percent. The only significant net increases reported between 1971 and 1974 were in the small category of publicly-operated halfway houses or group homes (Table II–25).

The reduction in juvenile institutional populations since 1971 appears to be due to two closely-related developments: court decisions and policies in a number of states which precluded assignment of status offenders to state institutions, and initiation of more general policies of "deinstitutionalization" of juvenile offenders in Massachusetts and—to a lesser

Table II–24

Number of Public Detention and Correctional Facilities for Juveniles, and Number of Juveniles, by Type of Facility and Level of Government, June 30, 1974

Type of Facility	Total		State		Local	
	Facilities	Juveniles	Facilities	Juveniles	Facilities	Juveniles
Total	**829**	**44,922**	**396**	**29,920**	**433**	**15,002**
Detention centers	331	11,110	50	1,214	281	9,796
Shelters	21	180	—	—	21	180
Reception and diagnostic centers	19	1,376	17	1,352	2	24
Training schools	185	25,397	151	23,373	34	2,024
Ranches, forestry camps, and farms	107	5,232	61	2,706	46	2,526
Halfway houses and group homes	166	1,727	117	1,275	49	452

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration preliminary tabulation from the LEAA/Census juvenile detection and correctional facility census of 1974.

extent—in a number of other states. It should be noted, however, that the nationwide survey by the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections (NAJC) in 1973–74, found that 35 percent of the juvenile corrections population and 29 percent of those in institutions, were still status offenders.[27] The same survey also noted relatively limited use of residential community-based programs in many states.

In contrast to the reduction in juvenile residents, the available statistics indicate little net change in total employment in these facilities. Thus, the Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities reported that full-time employees in state and local juvenile facilities totalled 39,391 in 1974, as compared with 39,521 in 1971, while the number of part-time employees actually increased from 3,851 in 1971 to 6,885 in 1974.

On the basis of data from the annual census surveys of employment and expenditures, it is apparent that employment in juvenile facilities remained fairly stable at the state level, as compared to a significant increase in local employment, for this function.

	Full-Time Equivalent Employees, in Juvenile Correctional Facilities	
	State	Local*
1971	29,712	7,771
1972	29,525	10,920
1973	29,019	11,359
1974	29,285	11,490
Percent change, 1971–74	−1.4%	+47.9%

*Data are limited to 312 large counties.

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, annual issues, 1971–74, Tables 45 and 46.

A full explanation for the apparent disparity between the sharp reduction in juveniles under custody, and some continued net growth in staff employment, is not available at the present time. The NAJC report has suggested, however, that in some states, "changed practices pertaining to status offenders have merely resulted in their being located in separate facilities even though these may be the same facilities that previously housed both delinquents and status offenders."[28] Hence, it is possible that differences in classification and reporting procedures, with respect to juvenile residents as compared with staffs, may account for some of this apparent disparity.

2. *Occupations in juvenile corrections facilities*. The most comprehensive recent data on the occupational distribution of juvenile corrections staff are provided by the LEAA/Census surveys for 1971 and 1973. As shown in Table II–26, child care workers—the largest single occupational group—accounted for 41 percent of total employment in 1973. An additional 31 percent were engaged in education and treatment functions—a much larger proportion than in adult correctional staffs. The remaining 27 percent consisted of personnel in administrative and staff functions.

Education and treatment staffs accounted for significantly larger proportions of total employment in the longer-term residential institutions, such as training schools, ranches, and camps, than in the short-term detention facilities. The former, too, tended to have a larger proportion of support personnel in operations and maintenance functions.

Further occupational detail for personnel in the "educational and treatment" group is available from the earlier 1971 Census. At that time, about 30

Table II–25

Juveniles in Custody by Type of Facility, 1971 and 1974

Type of Facility	Numbers						Percent Change 1971 to 1974		
	Total		State		Local		Total	State	Local
	1971	1974	1971	1974	1971	1974			
Total	**54,729**	**44,922**	**38,265**	**29,920**	**16,464**	**15,002**	**−18**	**−22**	**− 9**
Detention centers	11,767	11,010	689	1,214	11,708	9,796	− 6	+76	− 9
Shelters	360	180	110	—	250	180	−50	—	−28
Reception/diagnostic	2,153	1,376	2,153	1,352	—	24	−36	−37	—
Training schools	34,005	25,397	31,606	23,373	2,399	2,024	−25	−26	−16
Ranches, farms, camps	5,471	5,232	3,074	2,706	2,397	2,526	− 4	−12	+ 5
Halfway houses and group homes	973	1,727	633	1,275	340	452	+77	+101	+33

Sources: Special tabulations of the 1971 and 1974 Censuses of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA. Data for 1971 are revised from those previously published to exclude youthful and adult offenders housed in the same facilities. Data for 1974 are preliminary.

percent of all employees in this broad category were identified as academic teachers, and 13 percent as social workers. Other categories of treatment specialists represented included vocational teachers, librarians, recreation workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, and medical personnel.

3. *Administrators' assessments of manpower needs*. The trends described above, in turn, explain the considerably lesser emphasis on needs for additional staff on the part of juvenile corrections administrators responding to the NMS surveys in 1975, than by other categories of correctional executives. Thus, only 36 percent of the heads of juvenile correctional facilities reported that an inadequate number of authorized positions was their "most serious manpower problem," while almost as high a proportion (32 percent) identified inadequate training or staff.

Administrators of juvenile corrections facilities responding to the NMS survey reported that a relatively modest increase of 15 percent in total employment would permit them "to fulfill effectively all the duties and responsibilities" of their agency. This was the smallest percentage increase in total employment seen as needed by executives of the 10 criminal justice sectors surveyed. The juvenile administrators reported a much greater relative need for treatment personnel (29 percent), defined as psychiatrists, social workers and counselors, than for child care workers, such as house parents, matrons, and group supervisors (12 percent) (Table II–27).

In line with the above assessments, the same respondents reported that they expected an average (median) increase of only 2 percent in their child care worker staff during FY 1976, as compared to a projected increase of 3 percent in total employment.

Table II–26

Distribution of Employment in State and Local Juvenile Correctional Facilities, by Type of Facility and by Occupational Group, 1973

	Total	Detention Centers and Shelters	Reception or Diagnostic Centers	Training Centers	Ranches, Camps, Farms, Halfway Houses Group Homes
Administrative personnel[a]	12	10	14	11	16
Child care workers	41	47	47	40	30
Educational and treatment personnel	31	27	28	32	41
Operation and maintenance personnel	15	14	11	17	12
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

[a] Administrative personnel include management and associated staff, such as clerical workers.

Note: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Special tabulation of the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1972–73, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Table II–27

Executives' Views of Percent Change Needed in Staffing for Juvenile Corrections Activities, by Size of Agency, 1975

Size of Agency	Median Percent Increase in Employment Needed		
	Total Employment	Child Care Workers	Treatment Workers
Average (median)	15	12	29
150 or more employees	16	12	22
75 to 149	11	9	29
25 to 74	14	12	27
10 to 24	26	18	54
1 to 9	36	20	42

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Based on 495 responses.

Table II–27A

Number of Juvenile Residents per Employee in Selected Occupational Groups, in Juvenile Correctional Institutions, 1965 and 1975

Occupational Group	Residents Per Employee	
	1965	1975
Total	2.1	1.8
Custodial workers	4.9	3.9
Treatment personnel*	33.1	21.9
Educational personnel	16.7	11.9
Other	5.4	5.5

*Includes social workers, counselors, psychologists, and psychiatrists.

Sources: Data for 1965 are from National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Correction in the United States, 1966*, p. 254. Data for 1975 are from the NMS Survey of Juvenile Corrections, 1975 and refer only to training schools.

4. *Staffing ratios*. In 1966, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, in assessing the adequacy of staffing of juvenile institutions, used as a guide certain accepted professional staffing standards for professional treatment and educational personnel in state juvenile institutions. By combining separate staffing ratios for psychiatrists, psychologists, and case workers, a composite standard of 1 "treatment" specialist per 21.4 juveniles was adopted as a statistical guideline. Based on its 1965 survey, it found that only 14 state systems then met or exceeded this standard.[29] A standard of 1 teacher per 15 juveniles was also cited.

The American Correctional Association, in its 1966 Manual of Correctional Standards, also proposed a composite ratio of one staff employee (in all categories) per three juvenile inmates in juvenile institutions.

The actual ratios for selected occupational groups and total staff complements in state institutions are shown below for 1965 and 1975. The latter data are based on responses by training schools to the NMS survey in late 1975 and may not be completely comparable with the 1965 data, which also includes reception/diagnostic centers and camps.

Despite the lack of precise comparability in the types of agencies for which data were gathered, the substantial differences beteeen the 1965 and 1975 inmate/staff ratios strongly indicate improved staffing over the 10 years. Staffing levels recommended by the NCCD have been achieved for educational personnel and nearly achieved for treatment workers, on an overall basis. It should be noted that the number of employed includes some part-time workers and that the inmate to staff ratios would be modestly higher on a full-time basis. In any event, the overall ratios of children per total institutional staffs in both 1971 and 1975, are well below the ratio of 3:1 proposed by the ACA in 1966.

Thus, the latter comparison—as well as the administrators' own responses—both indicate a generally favorable overall staffing level for the state training centers.

E. Probation and Parole Agencies

Probation and parole agencies are responsible for the supervision of convicted offenders who are under sentence but not imprisoned. The offenders are either *probationers*—juveniles judged delinquent or adults convicted of a crime who are allowed to remain free in the community under specified conditions—or *parolees*—persons released from confinement under conditions of continued supervision. The other major function of these agencies is the investigation of persons under court adjudication, to aid judges in determining bail and the appropriate sentence, in case of conviction.

Almost half of state and local probation and parole agency employment is at the county level, where these agencies are frequently associated with the courts. State probation agencies account for an additional 40 percent of total employment. In a few states, especially in New England, a single state agency, generally with area offices, provides statewide services for probation or parole, or both. Only about 10 percent of total probation and parole employment is in municipal agencies (Table II–28).

The organization of, and responsibility for the

Table II–28

Employment in State and Local Probation and Parole Agencies by Level of Government, 1974

	Full-Time Equivalent Employment	
	Number	Percent of Total
Total	**46,000**	**100**
States	18,500	40
Local governments	27,500	60
312 large counties	18,500	40
384 large cities	4,000	9
Smaller counties and cities (est).	5,000	11

Source: *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1974.* Tables 45, 4, and 47.

delivery of probation and parole services varies widely among the 50 states. At one end of a continuum are "fully integrated" systems where adult and juvenile probation and parole, as well as correctional institutions and detention facilities, have been brought under a single overall state correctional administration. At the opposite extreme, there exist state correctional programs in which adult and juvenile parole, probation, and institutional components are functionally and administratively independent.

The NMS survey also obtained, from over 1,500 reporting agencies, data on major components of their caseloads, including supervision of adult probationers and parolees, and various types of investigations. Based on existing ACA statistical guides, which assume that the workload per investigation is equivalent to five persons under supervision, we have estimated that adult clients account for about 60 percent of total probation and parole workloads, and juveniles, about 40 percent, in these agencies. Other components of the distribution of workloads are shown in Table II–29.

1. *Recent employment trends*. Probation and parole activities have experienced more rapid growth in employment and workloads than any of the major correctional activities in recent years. The number of probation and parole officers in state and local agencies more than doubled, from 16,877 in 1967 to 35,072 in 1976, according to surveys of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. For the period 1971–74, annual reports covering all state agencies and large cities and counties indicate an increase of 40 percent, with the most rapid growth at the state level (Table II–30).

2. *Executive assessments of manpower needs*. Despite relatively rapid recent employment growth, heads of probation and parole activities, responding to the NMS survey in late 1975, reported a greater need for additional manpower than did heads of either adult or juvenile institutions. In response to a query concerning number of employees needed for effective performance of all their agencies' responsibilities, they estimated an average (median) increase in total staff of 35 percent was needed. Estimated additional requirements for probation and parole officers were somewhat lower (28 percent) suggesting a particularly large need for various categories of other personnel, such as supervisors, counselors, placement specialists, paraprofessionals, administrative, and clerical staffs (Table II–30a).

Table II–29

Estimated Distribution of Probation and Parole Workloads by Type of Activity, 1975

Activity	Percent of Total Reported Workload
All activities	**100.0**
Adult probation and parole—total	**59.6**
Supervision	38.2
Probation	32.0
Parole	6.2
Investigations	21.4
Pre-trial (e.g., bail or ROR)	5.2
Pre-sentence	10.1
Pre-release	2.7
Other	3.4
Juvenile probation and parole—Total	**40.4**
Supervision	26.3
Probation	17.7
Parole or after case	8.6
Investigations	14.1
Pre-hearing	9.2
Pre-release	1.4
Other	3.5

Source: NMS Survey of Probation and Parole Executives, 1975. Based on reports from about 1,500 agencies.

Field interviews with heads of adult and juvenile offices in 10 states provided additional insights on factors contributing to these manpower shortages, as indicated by the following excerpts from the field analysis report:

> NMS field interviews indicate that probation and parole agencies are now operating under conditions of manpower shortage, with long-standing gaps in staffing resulting from both increasing workloads and more stringent legal and functional requirements placed upon existing staff. Shortage conditions were evident in both juvenile and adult agencies; however, the manpower shortage in adult programs appeared to be more extensive.

Table II–30

Employment in Probation and Parole Activities, in States and Large Counties and Cities, 1971–74

Years	Total	States	312 Large Counties	384 Large Cities
1971	29,201	10,696	15,768	2,737
1972	32,832	14,246	15,457	3,129
1973	34,501	14,574	16,697	3,230
1974	41,006	18,492	18,518	3,996
Percent change, 1971–74	+40	+73	+17	+46

Note: An additional 5,000 full-time equivalent employees were estimated to be working in probation and parole activities in smaller counties and cities in 1974.

Table II–30A

Executives' Judgments of Increase in Staff Needed for Full Effective Performance, State and Local Probation and Parole Agencies, 1975

Agency Size	Percent Increase in Staff Needed	
	Total Employees	Probation/Parole Officers
All Agencies (median)	35%	28%
75 or more employees	30	24
25–74	30	30
10–24	46	34
Less than 10	70	45

Source: NMS Survey of Probation and Parole Administrators, 1975.

> All of the adult probation and parole agencies indicated that they were experiencing a critical manpower shortage. In half of the agencies, the shortage was confined to parole/probation officers. Other agencies indicated a need for more supervisory personnel and staff who specialize in investigatory functions, or a need for manpower in all categories of personnel including administrative and training officers and casework positions.
>
> In contrast to the adult agencies, there is no consistent pattern of manpower shortages in the juvenile probation and aftercare agencies included in the NMS [field visit] sample. A little less than half of the agencies sample indicated that they had less than optimum staffing. . .[30]

Among important exogenous factors contributing to increased agency workloads have been recent court decisions concerning the rights of adult parolees to due process proceedings prior to return to institutions, which have impacted on juvenile aftercare procedures, as well as those of parole offices. Increased integration of field and institutional services in some states has also served to increase paperwork loads.

In an effort to cope with these loads, agency administrators have created new specialist positions (e.g., court liaison specialists, investigative specialists vocational specialists) and have recruited more clerical or paraprofessional personnel. Considerable use has been made, too, of contractual services, of community resources management, and of volunteers in such functions as teachers, counselors, or auxiliary caseworkers. These innovations, according to the field reports, have served to broaden the services provided to clientele, but have not had any clear impact upon overall manpower needs.

3. *Staffing ratios*. Somewhat differing workload standards have been proposed for probation and parole officers, by the American Correctional Association, the President's Crime Commission, and the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. The ACA has recommended a standard of 50 "units" per month, per probation officer, under which a presentence investigation equals five units and a probationer or parolee under supervision equals one case unit.[31] The Corrections Task Force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended a standard of 20 to 75 case units per month depending on the intensity of supervision needed, or an average caseload of 35.[32] More detailed standards were recommended by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training which proposed the following probation or parole officer to offender ratios, depending upon the degree of supervision required.[33]

1:20 for intensive supervision
1:40–65 for normal supervision
1:350 for minimum surveillance

Based on responses to the NMS survey, statistics on the average number of "case units" per probation and parole officer, per month, have been compiled for 939 reporting agencies, using the ACA "case unit" definition. The results indicate a wide dispersion in case unit ratios among all major categories of agencies, but with much lower average ratios for adult parole and juvenile agencies, than for adult probation. Without more information on client characteristics—the proportion in need of intensive surveillance and assistance and those in need of minimum supervision—it is difficult to assess the adequacy of staff in each category. However, if we were to use as a rough guide the ACA standard of 50 case units per month, the survey results indicate that 72 percent of responding agencies and about 60 percent of all probation and parole officers in these agencies had caseloads which exceeded this standard. In general, the orientation of most agencies is towards somewhat closer supervision of juveniles and parolees, and minimum supervision of adult probationers. (Table III–31).

Table II–31

Percent Distribution of Probation and Parole Agencies by Size of Workload per Probation or Parole Office and by Type of Agency

Case Units Per Probation and Parole Officer Per Month	Agencies in Each Workload Interval by Type of Agency			
	All Agencies[a]	Juvenile Probation and Parole or Aftercare	Adult Probation	Adult Parole
Total	100	100	100	100
35 or less	17	27	7	38
35–50	11	15	2	26
50–75	17	17	9	9
75–125	24	19	20	9
125–200	17	11	27	12
200–350	10	7	21	3
More than 350	5	4	15	3
Median case units per officer per month	86	62	161	42
Number of reports	939[a]	389	132	34

[a] Includes agencies with combined adult and juvenile or combined adult probation and parole responsibilities which are excluded from the detailed type of agency distributions.

Note: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

F. Conclusions

A central issue addressed in this chapter was the assessment of the quantitative adequacy of personnel in correctional activities to perform their workloads and responsibilities. In addition to examining available indicators of correctional workloads, in relation to recent employment trends, our assessment relied on two sets of criteria: estimates by correctional administrators of their agencies' manpower requirements, and comparisons of actual staffing ratios, in relation to workloads, with various professional recommended staffing standards for these functions.

These criteria have certain inherent limitations. From a broader societal perspective, decisions concerning allocation of manpower resources to a particular public function, such as corrections, require an assessment of the relative social costs and benefits of additional expenditures for this purpose, as against competing demands for public funds. Thus, given the high priority assigned to public safety, the central issue—in this case—is the relative effects upon crime control of increased investments for such purposes as prison construction or staffing, as compared with alternative investments in—for example—law enforcement staff, or in community crime prevention programs.

Although adequate data for such a "cost-benefit" assessment were lacking, a consensus apparently emerged during the 1960's that confinement in large penal institutions was not a desirable option for most offenders, when judged by the criteria of effective rehabilitation of offenders and by the costs of imprisonment. This was reflected in the reduction of inmate population in adult institutions during the 1960's, and—more recently—by the decline in state juvenile training institutions, in the face of rising crime, arrest, and conviction rates.

This trend was reversed in the past several years when the number of adult inmates reached record highs, resulting in problems of severe prison overcrowding. Demographic factors, i.e., the rapid growth in the population of younger adults, have accounted for only part of this increase. In large part, this recent trend appears to reflect a hardening public attitude, particularly in the case of repeat offenders and those convicted of violent crimes. The rationale—although not always explicit—has rested on criteria other than offender rehabilitation, namely the deterrent effect of imprisonment and its obvious "incapacitation" effect, i.e., offenders in prison are not free to commit other crimes against citizens, while they are actually incarcerated.

Other recent trends have also impacted on the manpower needs assessments presented in this chapter. Recent court orders, combined with pressures from within prisons, have necessitated an increased emphasis on maintaining minimum levels of welfare and treatment resources and alleviating severe overcrowding. Despite the increase in imprisonment, probation and parole caseloads apparently have continued to grow rapidly. These agencies are also under pressure to provide closer supervision, and more supportive services to their clientele, as well as to conform with recent court decisions concerning applicability of "due process" to decisions concerning revocation of parole. On the other hand, such trends as movement of status offenders out of state training institutions and deinstitutionalization, have shifted a growing proportion of the juvenile corrections work load from state institutions to the community.

As a result of these trends, most categories of correctional executives—with the partial exception of those in juvenile correctional institutions—have reported substantial requirements for additional personnel to enable them to effectively fulfill their agencies' responsibilities. The greatest relative increases reported as needed were by probation and parole agency heads (35 percent) and by heads of state adult correctional institutions (20 percent), as compared with an estimated need of 15 percent by heads of juvenile institutions. Administrators of both adult and juvenile institutions reported a greater relative need for treatment specialists than for line custodial personnel. Heads of probation and parole agencies similarly reported a greater relative shortage of personnel in support and specialist roles, than of line probation and parole officers.

The NMS analyses of staffing ratios in these agencies, in relation to such workload factors as number of inmates or caseloads, generally confirmed these judgments concerning relative priorities. Based on comparison with professionally recommended staffing ratios, the most serious personnel shortages, in the agencies examined, were found in probation and parole agencies, and among treatment specialists in all categories of correctional institutions—particularly in local jails.

Correctional administrators surveyed by the NMS were also asked to project the employment trend for their agencies to the end of the fiscal year during which the survey was conducted, i.e., June 30, 1976. These projections indicated continued employment growth in all categories, but with more rapid growth, generally, in the agency and occupational categories for which the greatest current shortages were reported, e.g., treatment specialists. Since these estimates are normally based on existing budgetary and staff authorizations, they thus tend to confirm the general validity of the relative ordering of manpower needs priorities, derived from the preceding analyses.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The latter data are based on a somewhat more restrictive definition of the prisoner population, i.e., those sentenced to at least one year and one day. The difference between the latter definition and total sentenced prisoners is believed to be 6 percent or less.
2. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act* (1969), p. 55.
3. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967), p. 161.
4. James Q. Wilson, "Who is in Prison?" *Commentary* (November 1976): 57.
5. NMS Final Report, Volume VII, Part 2, pp. 325, 585.
6. Report by Wayne King, *The New York Times*, October 24, 1975.
7. Gettinger, Steve, "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-Time High." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (March 1976): 11.
8. *The New York Times*, January 5, 1976.
9. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (1967), p. 97.
10. The number of "prisoners confined" in state institutions was reported at about 205,000 in both 1962 and 1974, according to *National Prisoner Statistics* reports dated October 1964 and June 1976.
11. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change* (A report for the Commission by Louis Harris and Associates, 1968), p. 15.
12. Norval Morris, *The Future of Imprisonment* (The University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 161.
13. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (1967), p. 96.
14. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, Part 2, pp. 325 and 326.
15. Martinson, Robert, "What Works?—Questions and Answers About Prison Reform." *The Public Interest* (Spring 1974): 25.
16. Lipton, Douglas, Robert Martinson, and Judith Wilks, *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment* (Praeger Publishers, 1975); and T. Palmer, "Martinson Revisited." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* (July 1975): 142.
17. U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *The Nation's Jails* (A Report on the Census of Jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1975), p. iii.
18. *Ibid*., p. 23; and U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *National Jail Census* (1970),p. 2.
19. *National Jail Census* (1970), p. 10.
20. *Ibid*., p. 16.
21. *The Washington Star*, October 9, 1976, p. E1.
22. The *Census of Jails, 1972* report of 44,300 employees for 1972 is appreciably larger than the NMS estimate of 40,000 *full-time equivalent* employees for 1974, cited elsewhere in this report. The latter estimate is based on *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System for 1974*. It is likely that employment in a number of small jails attached to Sheriff or Police Departments was included under the "police protection" function in the latter report, even though reporting instructions to agencies such as sheriffs' offices, requested a separate classification of such personnel.
23. U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*. Issues for 1972, 1973, and 1974, Table 46.
24. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections*, pp. 96 and 97.

25. *The Nation's Jails*, pp. 23 and 34.
26. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Corrections in the United States* (1966), p. 142.
27. Robert D. Vintner, ed., *Time Out: A National Study of Juvenile Correctional Programs*. (University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1976).
28. Robert D. Vintner, *et al.*, *Juvenile Corrections in the States: Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization* (University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1975).
29. National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
30. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII.
31. American Correctional Association, *Manual of Correctional Standards* (1966), p. 98.
32. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections*, p. 30 and 70.
33. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training* (1969), p. 23.

CHAPTER III. THE OUTLOOK FOR CORRECTIONS EMPLOYMENT: MANPOWER PROJECTIONS TO 1985

A. Introduction

One of the major tasks of the National Manpower Survey is to project future personnel needs of state and local criminal justice agencies, by occupation, for a 10-year period to 1985. These projections and related estimates of recruitment and training needs are in turn designed to assist in determining the relative priorities for academic and training assistance among various sectors and occupations in the criminal justice system.

The estimates presented in this chapter portray the probable future trends in employment of corrections personnel. They are not an attempt to estimate "optimal" requirements for such personnel. In view of the uncertain relationship between correctional staffing and recidivism or crime rates, as discussed in the preceding chapter, a goals-oriented manpower projection for correctional manpower is neither practicable nor realistic as a basis for program planning.

The initial section of this chapter describes the basic assumptions, or scenario, which served as the basis for the manpower projections. (The more technical methodology, including a description of the National Planning Association's Criminal Justice Manpower Projections Model, is presented in Volume VI, Criminal Justice Manpower Planning.)

The second section presents the NPA projections of correctional employment, by agency category and occupation.

The third section reviews a number of specific issues or trends affecting the correctional system and separately assesses their possible manpower implications.

B. The Projection Scenario

The basic premise underlying the NPA Manpower Projection model is that the future demand for correctional and other criminal justice services will be largely determined by two key factors, in addition to population growth. These are: the future trend in crime rates (and related trends in arrests and corrections); and trends in the growth of total budget or fiscal capacity of state and local governments, as measured by their projected total expenditures for all purposes. In other words, as in the case of the demand for other products or services, the future need for various types of correctional activities and the community's willingness to pay for these services will jointly affect future employment trends.

Both crime rates and the levels of government spending are, in turn, influenced by a large number of social, economic, and institutional factors. In the case of crime rates, recent analyses of criminal behavior, in contrast to earlier criminological studies, have attempted to interpret most forms of crime within a rational decision-making framework: individuals are more likely to pursue criminal careers, rather than legal activity, if the economic returns from crime are perceived to be better than the alternatives available to them, after allowing for the risks entailed in criminal activity. Thus, those who are poor, unemployed and economically disadvantaged are most prone to engage in crimes such as robbery because they have less to risk and because their alternative ways of earning a livelihood are restricted. Large urban centers, which include both concentrations of poor, minority populations as well as concentrations of wealth—i.e., "crime opportunities"—are thus more prone to higher crime rates than are smaller, more homogenous, middle-class communities. Youth, and particularly disadvantaged youth, are much more crime prone—both because they have the highest unemployment rates and the most limited earnings potential in legal pursuits, and because they are more likely to take risks than more mature individuals. However, to the extent that law enforcement and criminal justice agencies increase the risks of apprehension and punishment, they increase the "costs" of criminal activity and serve to deter crime.

The above analysis thus suggests some of the key variables that may affect future crime trends. Among them are future trends in the level of general economic opportunity, as measured by such factors as the unemployment rate and per capita income, trends in the proportion of youth in the population, and trends in the concentration of population in urban areas. In addition, community investments in law enforcement, judicial process, and correctional agencies can affect these trends to the extent that they increase the probabilities of arrest and imprisonment. These and similar variables have all been found to contribute significantly to variations in reported crime rates.

Among these factors, one of the most important—and predictable—is the proportion of youth in our population. The sharp escalation of crime rates in the mid-1960's coincided with the "coming of age" of the large, post-World War II baby-boom generation. During these years, juveniles and young adults accounted for a large and growing share of those apprehended for many categories of serious crime. The outlook now is for a reversal of this trend. In the past decade and a half, rapid growth in the number of youths and young adults, aged 15–24 years, increased that group from 13.4 percent of the population in 1960 to 18.7 percent in 1974. This proportion will stabilize in the period 1974–80, and will drop significantly to 16.4 percent by 1985.

Another demographic factor—the proportion of our population concentrated in metropolitan areas—is also expected to decline, resulting eventually in a lower crime rate. Over a period of decades, the proportion of our population concentrated in large metropolitan areas has steadily grown—and these areas, as has been noted, have included the highest concentrations of crime. Between 1960 and 1970, the percentage of the population residing in metropolitan areas (SMSA's) rose from 63.3 percent to 68.6 percent, with a corresponding decline in the proportion living in smaller non-metropolitan communities or rural areas. This pattern now appears to have reversed itself. Recent population growth has been more rapid in the non-metropolitan areas, even including those well removed from commuting range, than it has been in metropolitan areas.[1] The proportion of the population living in SMSA's has declined steadily in each year since 1970, to 67.2 percent in 1974. This reversal in trend is probably due to a variety of factors, including changing patterns of industrial location, the regional movement of population to the "Sun Belt" states and the growth in the retired population. A continuation of the recent decline is assumed in our scenario. In 1974, SMSA boundaries were redefined to increase the number of SMSA's to 266 and the percent of population in SMSA's to 72.8. By 1985, the population in these 266 SMSA's is projected to decline to 71.2 percent of the total. This population shift may be accompanied by growing crime rates in outlying areas—a pattern already suggested by recent trends in crime statistics.[2] However, in view of the very sharp differences in crime rates among communities of different sizes, the net effect is expected to be favorable.

Other general factors affecting the future demand for correctional services can be projected with much less confidence than the demographic trends described above. The most critical of these is the future state of the nation's economy. The overall level of economic activity, as measured by such statistics as the gross national product (GNP), has a direct impact on governmental tax revenues and hence on the ability of state and local governments to expand public employment. It also has a significant effect upon crime rates, in view of the observed direct relationship between unemployment and crime. However, despite the development of increasingly sophisticated economic models, any long-term projections of the nation's economy are subject to large potential error, simply because they entail numerous assumptions concerning future national fiscal and economic policies, as well as international economic and political conditions.

The economic scenario followed in the NMS manpower projections is based on the National Economic Projections Series of the National Planning Association. These projections provide short-term forecasts of probable economic trends to 1980 and are designed to portray an attainable growth path for the economy beyond 1980, resulting in relatively full employment by 1985. The short-term economic outlook provides for a relatively low average GNP growth rate of 2.7 percent annually (in constant dollars) during the period 1974–80, reflecting only partial recovery from the 1974–76 recession. This is followed by a substantially higher GNP growth rate of 4.2 percent annually during the period 1980–85, concurrent with a projected reduction in the unemployment rate from about 7 percent in 1980 to 5 percent in 1985.

The above demographic and economic trends imply the following outlook for the key controlling variables affecting prospective criminal justice employment:

- *The crime rate*, as measured by the FBI Index for Serious (Part I) Offenses, is expected to continue to grow between 1974 and 1980 due, in part, to the continued high average unemployment levels projected for this period. Its projected average growth rate of 1.8 percent per year between 1974 and 1980 is much lower than for recent periods, however, as a result of the stabilization of the proportion of youth in the population. A significant decline in the crime rate is projected for the period 1980–85, at a rate of 3.9 percent annually, reflecting mainly the combined effect of reduction in the proportion of youth in the population and the assumed reduction in unemployment. Other factors contributing to the anticipated decline in the crime rate are the projected increase in criminal justice expenditures and employment (discussed below) and the likely trend towards a reduction in the proportion of the total population living in metropolitan areas.

- *Total state and local expenditures*, the index of the general ability of these governments to pay for criminal justice services, are projected to grow at a relatively low annual rate of 3.3 percent between 1974 and 1980, in constant dollars, as a result of the continuing effects of the recent economic recession upon state and local revenues and of the limited recovery projected to 1980. This is a continuation of the slow rate of increase experienced in recent years. For example, these expenditures grew at an annual rate of 5.0 percent between 1965 and 1970, in constant dollars, reflecting the growing revenues of state and local governments during the latter period, rising costs, and growing community demands for a wide range of public services. The rate slowed to 3.2 percent in 1971–74, and approximately the same rate is projected through 1980. A more rapid growth of these expenditures, at a rate of 4.8 percent per year, is projected for 1980–85, reflecting the assumed recovery to a high employment economy by the latter year.
- *Criminal justice expenditures by state and local governments*, for all categories of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies are projected to increase by 52 percent, in constant dollars, between 1974 and 1985. A growth rate of 4.3 percent per year is projected between 1974–80. This rate of growth is considerably higher than the projected growth rate of 3.3 percent for total state and local expenditures—reflecting the effect of the continued growth in crime rates and the consequent high priority assigned by most communities to law enforcement and related services. The projected growth in criminal justice expenditures during 1980–85 is expected to decrease to 3.5 percent per year, despite the projected growth in total state and local expenditures of 4.8 percent during this period, because of reduction in crime rates.

C. Key Trends Affecting Corrections Employment

In addition to the effects of the projected overall trends in crime rates and governmental expenditures described above, the outlook for employment in the correctional function will be influenced by a number of more specific trends, which will affect the rates of growth of different categories of correctional agencies and occupations.

1. *Imprisonment trends*. The increase in state prison population, which began in 1973, is expected to continue, but at a slower growth rate than in the period 1972–75. In the latter period, the number of state prison inmates sentenced to at least a year and a day had increased from 174,000 to 217,000, according to preliminary estimates. (See Chapter II.) The increase in inmate population has been widespread, affecting most states and regions. It must be attributed, in large part, to a general hardening of public attitudes towards serious and chronic offenders, which—in turn—has influenced the actions of prosecutors, courts, and correctional agencies. Recent policy statements by national leaders have both reflected and reinforced these attitudes.

Our projections for the period 1974–80 assume a continuation of this trend, resulting in a growth of the prisoner population to 243,000 in 1980, corresponding to an average increase of 4.2 percent per year. The reduction in crime rates is expected to slow down the growth of prisoner population during the period 1980–85, resulting in an estimated total of 252,000 in the latter year. The average annual growth rate in the state prisoner population for the entire period 1974–85 is estimated at 2.6 percent.

These projected rates of growth in each period are significantly greater than the projected growth trends in the number of serious (Part I) crimes, or in arrests for such offenses. The estimated prison population of 252,000 for 1985 is also substantially higher than an alternative projection of 233,000 which assumes that the prison population in 1985 will maintain the same proportion of the population in each age group as it did in 1974.

On the other hand, the projected growth of prison population is much less than would result if the rates of increase in the most recent years had been extended over the next decade. To illustrate, state prison populations grew about 25 percent from the end of 1972 to the end of 1975.[3] A continuation of this rate of growth would result in a projected prison population of about twice the 1975 level or 435,000 in 1985. Such a trend must be considered highly improbable because: (1) in view of the large number of prison systems already at or above rated capacity, it would imply a vast prison construction program, as well as greatly increased expenditures by state governments for prison operation, not compatible with either past trends or with anticipated overall growth in state government budgets in the coming decade; and (2) because it does not allow for the probable slowdown in growth of crime rates during the second half of the current decade, and for the projected reduction in crime rates during the period 1980–85.[4]

2. *The trend to community-based programs*. During the period 1971–74, correctional employment at the local level increased at an annual rate of 7.1 percent, as compared with an annual increase of 4.5 percent for state correctional employees. A large portion of this relatively rapid growth, at the local level, can be attributed to a shift in responsibility for juvenile corrections in a number of states from state institutions, such as training centers, to alternative community-based facilities and programs, and for a general trend towards deinstitutionalization of certain categories of juvenile offenders, i.e., "status" offenders. Thus, between 1971 and 1973, the number of juveniles in training schools decreased by 26 percent and the number in detention centers by 8 percent, while the number of juvenile residents in locally-based group homes and halfway houses increased by 58 percent from a very low base.[5] Although there has been some relative increase in the use of community-based programs for adult offenders, this trend has been less pronounced.

Based on this recent experience, a continued growth in the local government share of all correctional employment has been projected—from 40 percent in 1974 to 45 percent in 1985.

3. *The growth in probation and parole activities*. Probation and parole activities have been the most rapidly growing sector of correctional employment. Total probation and parole employment rose by almost 40 percent between 1971 and 1974, reflecting the continued rise in crime rates and convictions, and the fact that—despite the growth in state prison inmate population after 1972—a very large proportion of those convicted of offenses are placed under probational supervision, rather than in residential institutions. Probation and parole agency workloads are projected to grow at a relatively rapid rate in the coming decade, and—as a result—their share of total correctional employment will increase from 23 percent in 1974 to 30 percent by 1985. (One factor which may serve to check this growth trend is the possible adoption of fixed sentence policies for adult offenders which would either curtail or eliminate the parole function. The current status of this development is discussed later in this chapter.)

4. *Staffing ratios*. Available data, reviewed in Chapter II, indicate a significant reduction during the past decade in the ratio of inmates per staff member at state adult correctional institutions—from 4.5 inmates per employee (full-time and part-time) in 1962 to 3.1 in 1974. This trend was indicated for both custodial and treatment personnel, but was most pronounced for certain categories of treatment specialist positions, such as doctors and social workers, which had been—and continue to be—seriously understaffed, in relation to recommended professional standards. NMS projections assume a continuation of these trends to 1985, with further reduction in both the custodial officer and treatment specialist ratios—although at slower rates than during the preceding 12-year period.

Table III–1

Trends in Crimes, Arrests, and Imprisonment Actual: 1971, 1974; Projected: 1980, 1985

(In thousands)

	Actual[a]		Projected[b]		Average Annual Growth Rates		
	1971	1974	1980	1985	1971–74	1974–80	1980–85
Part I—Crimes	8,537	10,192	11,990	10,310	6.1	2.7	−3.0
Part I—Arrests	1,708	2,164	2,604	2,421	8.2	3.1	−1.4
Prisoners in state institutions (000)	177	190	243	252	2.4	4.2	0.7

[a] Sources: Crimes and Arrests based on FBI *Uniform Crime Reports, 1971, 1974. Prisoners data from U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, NPS Bulletin SD-NPS-PSF1, 1974.*

[b] *Source: NPA Projections. (See Volume VI, Criminal Justice Manpower Planning.)*

D. Projections of Corrections Employment

The projections of employment in state and local correctional agencies for 1980 and 1985 are presented in Table III–2. Total corrections employment, in terms of full-time equivalent employees, is expected to increase from 203,000 in 1974 to 324,000 in 1985, or by 60 percent. The most rapid growth is anticipated for probation and parole agencies, which are expected to more than double their employment over this period, based on an assumed continuation of recent growth trends for this function. Employment in adult institutions is expected to increase by 58 percent between 1974 and 1985, as a result of projected increases in the prison inmate population and of some further reductions in the inmate-staff ratio. Juvenile institutions, on the other hand, are expected to experience very little net growth—only 12 percent—over this period, with reductions in employment in state juvenile institutions, such as training centers, offset by continued growth at the local levels.

Since these statistics are limited to employment in state and local correctional agencies, including probation and parole, they do not reflect additional manpower requirements for operation of community-based facilities by private agencies under contract, nor do they allow for services performed by other public non-correctional agencies for individuals under correctional control, such as education, training, job placement, and social services. Some further increase in manpower needs for all of the latter functions can be expected; however, no comprehensive statistics on employment associated with these functions are available.

Estimates have also been made of projected employment in key correctional occupations, or functions, including custodial personnel, probation and parole officers, treatment specialists, and management personnel. These are based on an analysis of staffing patterns for the various categories of correctional agencies and of available data on recent trends in staffing, as well as on responses by correctional executives to NMS survey questions concerning

Table III–2

Current and Projected Corrections Employment by Level of Government and Function

Occupation	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (000)			Percent Distribution			Percent Change 1974–85
	1974[a]	1980	1985	1974	1980	1985	
Total	**203**	**278**	**324**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**60**
Adult institutions	106	145	167	52	52	52	58
Juvenile institutions	43	47	48	21	17	15	12
Probation/Parole	46	75	96	23	27	30	109
Administrative and other	8	11	12	4	4	4	50
State[a]	**113**	**149**	**173**	**56**	**54**	**53**	**53**
Adult institutions	66	90	104	33	32	32	58
Juvenile institutions	29	26	24	14	9	7	−17
Probation/Parole	18	33	45	9	12	14	150
Local[b]	**81**	**118**	**138**	**40**	**42**	**43**	**70**
Adult institutions	40	55	63	20	20	19	58
Juvenile institutions	14	21	24	7	8	7	71
Probation/Parole	27	42	51	13	15	16	89

[a] Source: The 1974 distribution of correction employment is from LEAA/ Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, 1974, Tables 9, 45, 46, and 47. These estimates exclude employment in "miscellaneous" correctional agencies. 1980–85: NPA Projections (see text and volume VI).

[b] Estimates of total local employment by function were based on distributions of employment in 384 cities and 312 counties which represented 80 percent of total local corrections employment.

expected trends in manpower needs for various correctional functions.

- *Correctional management*. The number of managerial personnel in correctional activities is expected to increase by 68 percent between 1974 and 1985, as a result of increased decentralization of correctional activities to the local level and of increasing emphasis on improved planning and coordination of correctional activities at the state level (see Table III–3).
- *Custodial officers*. The number of custodial officers in prisons, jails, and similar institutions is expected to increase by 57 percent, from 63,400 in 1974 to 99,700 in 1985, as a result of the projected growth in the number of inmates and of some further reduction in the inmate-staff ratio.
- *Child care workers*. Employment of child care workers, on the other hand, is projected to increase by only 10 percent between 1974 and 1985, as a result of the projected continued trend towards deinstitutionalization for certain categories of juvenile offenders, and the consequent slow net growth in overall employment in juvenile institutions.
- *Treatment specialists*. This functional group includes a wide range of professional and allied specialties, such as social workers, psychologists and teachers, as well as professional medical and dental personnel. An increase of 10,600 or 56 percent in the number of these specialists is projected between 1974 and 1985. This will result, primarily, from a projected increase in the number and proportion of such positions in adult institutions, based on a continuation of recent trends. Very limited net growth in employment of treatment personnel in juvenile institutions is projected due to the anticipated continued decline in the use of state training centers, which employ a larger proportion of such personnel than do community-based facilities.
- *Probation and parole officers*. Employment of probation and parole officers is expected to increase by about 12,000 or 52 percent between 1974 and 1985. This rate of increase is substantially lower than the projected overall growth of 109 percent in total employment of probation and parole agencies over the same period. Analysis of recent trends and of responses to the NMS survey by heads of probation and parole offices, suggests that the greatest relative growth in these agencies will be for various supporting and auxiliary-type positions, including paraprofessional, clerical, and administrative personnel.

Table III–3

Employment in Selected Correctional Occupations: Actual: 1974; Projected: 1980, 1985

	Estimated Full-Time Equivalent Employees (000)			Percent Change 1974–85
	1974[a]	1980	1985	
Management	13.8	19.5	23.2	68
Custodial officers (adult institutions)	69.5	93.8	109.3	57
Child care workers	17.8	19.4	19.5	10
Treatment specialists	22.6	29.4	35.2	56
Probation and parole officers	22.5	29.8	34.2	52

[a] NMS estimates adapted from the following sources: NMS Executive Survey of Probation and Parole Executives, 1975; LEAA-Census, Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974; LEAA-Census, *Census Survey of State Corrections Facilities*, 1974; LEAA-Census, *Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities*, 1973 (unpublished data). 1980–85: NPA Projections.

Although the above projections have been presented in a relatively precise form, they are, of course, subject to considerable margins of uncertainty. These stem, in part, from the limitations of available data on current and past employment in the various categories of correctional agencies and occupations. More important, however, is the fact that the correctional field has been—and will probably continue to be—highly controversial, in terms of its basic objectives, strategies and organizational structure. This past 10-year period has witnessed an apparent reversal in policy wih respect to adult offenders—from one designed to minimize the role of imprisonment in conventional institutional settings to a sterner policy, at least for chronic offenders—which has brought the size of prison populations to an all-time high. Various legislative proposals, either already enacted or under active review in some states, which provide for fixed sentences, or for mandatory minimum sentences, are indicative of this changed attitude. At the same time there has been a continued trend towards reduced reliance on large training centers for juveniles in favor of both diversionary policies and increased use of community-based facilities. The following section summarizes pertinent findings on several of these developments. The specific developments reviewed are: (1) the trend to community-based facilities, (2) work-study programs, and (3) the correctional implications of recent proposed changes in sentencing policies.

E. Assessment of Key Correctional Developments

1. *Increased use of community-based facilities*. In the face of the apparent failure of conventional prisons or juvenile training institutions to accomplish rehabilitation of offenders—and of the high cost of inmate maintenance in these institutions—correctional reformers have placed increased emphasis upon the role of small community-based facilities. These, according to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice "offer a middle ground between the often nominal supervision in the community provided by probation services and confinement in an institution."[6] The Commission's Task Force on Corrections, in supporting this alternative, further noted:

> The advent of these programs in the post-war decades and their recent growth in numbers and prominence are perhaps the most promising developments in corrections today. . . . They therefore represent an important means for coping with the mounting volume of offenders that will be pouring into corrections in the next decade.[7]

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals similarly recommended transfer of most adult inmates from the large existing state institutions to community-based programs, as well as an eventual phasing out of the use of the state institutions for juveniles and youths.[8]

Community correctional centers—although varying widely in specific characteristics—can be classified into two major categories: pre-release centers for adult offenders, and halfway houses, which may be utilized for either adult or juvenile offenders.

- *Pre-release centers* are usually small facilities (100 residents or less) in which inmates stay for the final parts of their sentence as briefly as two weeks or as long as a year or more and participate in a wide range of community release programs. The important distinction is that this is pre-parole with residents still serving their sentences while living in the facility. These centers are normally state-funded and publicly operated facilities.
- *Halfway houses* are often similar to the pre-release or community correctional centers, when utilized for adult offenders, except that residents have already been paroled and are living at the facility as a condition of that parole. In the case of juvenile offenders, halfway houses—or group homes—have been defined in the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections as:

> . . .facilities generally handling between 5 and 30 adjudicated offenders and situated in urban locales. They are distinguished from institutions not only by their smaller size and community location but also by their encouragement of offenders' attendance at local schools or involvement in local employment. . . .This definition excludes nonresidential or 'day treatment' programs although in some states a few offenders are allowed to live outside the residential program.[9]

Halfway houses are usually (but not always) operated by private organizations under contract with a State Department of Corrections.

Only partial statistics on community correctional center inmates and staffs are available at present. The 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities, covering all states other than Massachusetts, reported that of a total of 188,000 inmates, about 9,000 or 4.8 percent were confined in some 158 "community centers," nearly 3,000 of the inmates being reported by North Carolina alone. These included both publicly operated and contract facilities. Almost all were classified as "minimum security" facilities. Of these 158 centers, 137 had fewer than 20 full-time staff positions.

The National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections reported a total average daily population of 5,663 juveniles in more than 50 separate state-related community-based residential facilities during 1974. These accounted for 17.7 percent of the total number of juveniles in state residential corrections programs. The total covered both privately operated and state operated programs, and contrasted with a much lower LEAA/Census estimate of 1,218 youths assigned to state-operated community centers alone in 1973.[10]

Although the above data sources are not completely comparable, they indicate a much greater relative utilization of community centers for juvenile programs (17.7 percent) than for adult inmates (4.8 percent).

Some additional insight on current and anticipated use of community-based programs is provided by responses of correctional executives to an NMS question concerning the functions performed by their agencies. Nearly one-half (46 percent) of the executives of both adult and juvenile institutions reported that they were currently administering community-based facilities or halfway houses. However, a somewhat greater proportion of heads of juvenile agencies, 39 percent, reported that they expected increased staffing needs for either existing or planned community programs in the next two years, as compared with 31 percent of the heads of adult correctional institutions (Table III–4).

The rather extensive use of some form of community-based facility—although on a small scale—was also confirmed by the field visits of NMS staff to correctional activities in 10 states. Eight of these 10 states reported operation or use of small, community-based correctional facilities for adults. Among these the largest number of community-based facilities for adult corrections was 23 and the smallest number was 3. Ratios of inmates in institutions to inmates in community-based facilities varied, but—in each state visited—the residents of adult community facilities represented only a small proportion of the total number incarcerated.

Specific findings, based on these field interviews, are summarized below:

- Most of these correctional departments used community-based facilities for adult inmates nearing the end of their prison sentence or for those approaching parole eligibility. None of the departments sampled indicated that such facilities were used for housing newly committed offenders or those persons with long amounts of time remaining until potential release. Community-based facilities were thus being used with greater emphasis as part of pre-release programs than as a long-term housing alternative for sentenced offenders.
- None of the departments or agencies visited had established a classification process for making rapid initial assignments of new offenders to small community-based facilities. To institute such a classification policy for new offenders would produce significant changes in manpower needs—increasing numbers of inmates would be housed in smaller facilities, requiring a change in both programs and personnel. None of the departments visited indicated plans for such a change in the organization of facilities and in program priorities.
- While there is a strong commitment to community corrections, caution and selectivity are being exercised in placing offenders in community-based facilities. While increasing inmate populations result in pressure upon administrators to keep community facilities filled to maximum levels, administrators are also pressured to select inmates who have demonstrated "readiness" for such an experience in order to avoid adverse community reactions.
- NMS staff expected that there would be significant differences in the manpower, education, and training needs of community-based facilities, as compared with large institutions. For the most part, however, they found very limited staff specialization or specialized staff training to meet the very specific treatment needs and priorities of such facilities.

Table III–4

Responses by Correctional Executives on Current and Expected Use of Community-Based Facilities or Halfway Houses, 1975

	Adult Institutions	Juvenile Institutions
Number responding	208	560
Percent Distribution:		
Activity currently performed—Total	**46**	**46**
Manpower needs will increase in next two years	24	27
Manpower needs will stay about the same	20	18
Manpower needs will decline	2	1
Activity not Currently Performed—Total	**54**	**55**
Will not be added in next two years	47	43
Will be added	7	12
Total	100	100

Note: Percentage detail may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.
Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

In contrast to the relatively limited and supplementary role of community-based institutions for adults, these programs have been advanced as a major alternative to institutionalization in the case of juveniles, on the grounds that they are more humane, more effective, and less costly. The sharp decline in the number of juvenile inmates in state training centers—from nearly 41,000 in 1969 to 25,000 in 1974—combined with indicators of growth in the community-based programs, suggest that this trend has, in fact, occurred. Moreover, as noted above, nearly two-fifths of the 500 juvenile corrections executives responding to the NMS survey in 1975, anticipated an increased use of community-based programs in the next two years.

Only one state—Massachusetts—has actually implemented a program of complete deinstitutionalization of its juvenile offenders. In 1972, all of the state's juvenile training centers were closed. As of August 1975, of 1,864 youths sentenced to the state's Department of Youth Services, 1,378 had been assigned to a variety of nonresidential programs or were living at home under minimal supervision, 167 were in foster care homes, 214 were in group care facilities, and 105 in secure programs.[11] Although no other state had gone as far as Massachusetts, to date, 3 other states—South Dakota, Minnesota, and Utah—had assigned between 50 and 60 percent of their juveniles in residential programs to community centers by 1974, and an additional 8 states had deinstitutionalized between 25 and 50 percent of their juvenile residential inmates.[12]

The limited available evidence on results of deinstitutionalization of juveniles is still not conclusive. Preliminary and partial results of a followup study of the Massachusetts experience, by Lloyd E. Ohlin and associates, have indicated few significant differences in juvenile recidivism rates since deinstitutionalization, compared with those of a control sample for 1968, prior to initiation of the program.[13] From a cost standpoint, it appears that the per capita costs of custody in community-based, mainly privately operated, facilities have been much lower than in state training centers. However, these savings have been partly offset, to date, by the continued maintenance of the state training centers and staffs in states other than Massachusetts, and by their higher per capita costs under conditions of declining inmate populations.[14]

From a long-range manpower standpoint, a continued trend towards deinstitutionalization clearly implies a reduction in staffs of state operated training centers—after some period of adjustment, but an increase in personnel needs for largely private community residential centers, as well as for juvenile probation activities. However, no comprehensive data are available on personnel of contract-operated community facilities.

2. *Work and study release programs*. Work and study release arrangements are, typically, an important component of the programs of community-based centers. However, such programs frequently are conducted by larger, conventional prison facilities as well. In the 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities, 52 percent of all prisons reported having work release programs, as compared with 91 percent of the community centers. Similarly, 27 percent of the prisons reported having study-release programs, as compared with 60 percent of the community centers.[15]

Although clearly not synonymous with either "deinstitutionalization" or the "community center" concept, work and study release programs have in common an approach which enables the inmate to leave the confines of the institution, to ease the transition to civilian life and to increase the capabilities of ex-offenders to find suitable employment in lawful pursuits. These programs, unlike some of the more innovative community correctional center program, have a long history in the field of corrections. The first work release legislation for adult inmates was enacted in Wisconsin in 1913. Work release, as well as parallel study release programs, came to be more generally adopted beginning in the mid-1950's. By 1971, 42 states, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government had authorized work release programs.[16]

This trend received additional impetus from the following findings and recommendations by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice:

> All of the programs described here suggest that crime control can be increased by making the transition from confinement in a correctional institution to freedom in the community a gradual, closely supervised process. This process of graduated release permits offenders to cope with their many post-release problems in manageable steps, rather than trying to develop satisfactory home relationships, employment, and leisure-time activity all at once upon release. It also permits staff to initiate early and continuing assessment of progress under actual stress of life.

The Commission recommended:

> Graduated release and furlough programs should be expanded. They should be accompanied by guidance and coordinated with community treatment.[17]

These programs tend to be more frequent for adult inmates than for juvenile inmates. The NMS surveys of correctional administrators found that nearly 58 percent of state adult correctional institutions and 36 percent of juvenile institutions operated work release programs in 1975. Study release programs were in effect in 45 percent of the adult institutions, and 38 percent of the juvenile institutions.

Field visits to 10 states, all of which were operating release programs, found that these programs can be effectively administered from small as well as from large facilities. Most often, the two programs were operated together. Typical staffing for the function was: 1 supervisor, 3–10 custodial workers, 2–3 counselors.

Information gathered in the field visits indicated that the initiation of these programs had little effect on the numbers of employees needed, with workers being shifted from other duties. This was born out for juvenile corrections agencies by the NMS. About 80 percent of juvenile correctional administrators reported no change in personnel needs associated with work/study release programs. However, about half of the adult corrections agencies with these programs reported that more personnel were needed as a result of their use (Table III–5).

A change in skill needs was reported by about half the adult correction agencies and 20 percent of the juvenile agencies operating these programs. Few states were found to have formalized new position descriptions for their work and study release programs. Though new skills were needed, current staff could be effectively utilized. About half the states visited were using ex-offenders and volunteers in these programs.

Growth in the use of work and study release programs is expected to continue, but in a cautious manner. In the NMS survey of adult corrections executives among 16 types of correctional activities for which executives were asked their opinion on increased needs for personnel in the next two years, work release ranked 8th and study release ranked 13th in order of frequency. Among executives of juvenile facilities, work and study release ranked lowest in terms of prospective employment growth, reflecting the less frequent use of such programs for juveniles.

Table III–5

Executive Responses on Effects of the Adoption of Work and Study Release Programs on Personnel and Skill Needs

(Percent distribution)

	State Adult Corrections		State and Local Juvenile Corrections	
	Work Release	Study Release	Work Release	Study Release
No change in number of personnel needed	44	56	79	83
Skill needs unchanged	35	40	70	74
Skill needs changed	9	16	9	9
More personnel needed	56	44	20	14
Skill needs unchanged	13	12	8	4
Skill needs changed	43	32	13	9
Fewer personnel needed	1	—	1	3
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Note: Percentage detail may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.
Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

A high proportion of correctional officials who were interviewed in the course of NMS field visits reported that their release programs were highly successful. However, community resistance to these programs appears to be an important factor limiting their growth potential.

3. *Recent developments in sentencing policies*. In addition to developments within the correctional system itself, such as those described in the preceding section, the outlook for correctional manpower can be greatly influenced by a variety of external influences and pressures which could serve to significantly affect the size of the population under correctional control and the number and categories of personnel needed. One such influence, noted in our preceding assessments of correctional staffing trends, has been the growing number of court decisions concerned with offender rights, which—in some instances—have imposed specific standards on the size of prison population in relation to prison capacity, and on the amount and quality of services to be provided to inmates. Another development, discussed below, is a movement towards adoption of revised sentencing policies whose effect—under certain conditions—could be to further accelerate the recent trends towards increased reliance on imprisonment. This includes the trend towards determinate or "fixed" sentences, and towards mandatory minimum sentences for certain categories of offenders.

Under typical existing sentencing practices, the prosecutors and courts exercise wide discretion in determining whether convicted offenders will be incarcerated and on the length of their sentence. Parole boards, similarly, exercise wide discretion in determining the length of imprisonment. This direction is exercised through the widespread practice of plea bargaining, and through the equally widespread practice of "indeterminate sentencing," which—in effect—relegates to parole boards much of the decision-making authority on actual length of incarceration. A completely indeterminate sentence does not have any fixed date by which the offender must be released. For example, until recently the California indeterminate sentencing laws permitted felons to be incarcerated from one year to life, release being entirely a matter of parole board decision. A more typical indeterminate sentence (also called an indefinite sentence) provides for a broad range, e.g., one to five years within which the parole board has discretion to release an inmate. Under this practice, the sentenced individual may be released at any time after the first year of incarceration, but must be released after five years. In both instances, according to Dershowitz, the sentence "is more or less indeterminate to the extent that the amount of time actually to be served is decided not by a judge at the time sentence is imposed, but rather by an administrative board while the sentence is being served."[18]

The indeterminate sentence has come under attack on the ground of inequity and because it does not serve as an effective deterrent to crime. In theory, indeterminate sentences provide latitude for parole boards to compensate for sentencing disparities to some extent. In practice this often does not happen. In proposing substitution of a fixed sentencing policy, the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing recommended that "for each subcategory of crime. . .the legislature, or a body it designates, adopt a presumptive sentence that should generally be imposed on typical first offenders who have committed the crime in the typical fashion."[19]

The Task Force also recommended: (1) the need to define aggravating and mitigating factors, (2) mandatory sentencing hearings, (3) a reduction in the lengths of sentences imposed but certain confinement for some duration for those committing serious crime, (4) periodic review of crime categories, presumptive sentences and aggravating and mitigating factors, and (5) elimination of barriers to the employment of ex-offenders.

At the time of preparation of this report, only three states, Maine, California and Indiana, had enacted fixed sentencing laws effective at various dates between March 1976 and July 1977. About 10 additional states were actively considering such legislation.[20] According to a recent analysis by the Council of State Governments, three general approaches are being taken. Under the *legislative* method (which has been proposed but not yet enacted in California, Illinois, and Minnesota), the legislature fixes the penalty statutorily, with limited allowance for judicial discretion in the case of aggravating or mitigating circumstances. With *judicial* definite sentencing, the legislature permits more judicial discretion in the selection of a definite sentence by establishing a statutory maximum. The *administrative* approach proposed by the Minnesota Correctional Authority and implemented by the California Adult Authority narrows discretion by establishing definite parole release dates within specified ranges according to the offense and characteristics of the offender.

The long-term impact of these proposals upon prison populations and related staffing needs cannot be determined from available information. This will clearly depend upon the relationship in each state between the actual average length of imprisonment under previous practices as compared with those specified under fixed sentencing rules. In the short term, the extent of existing prison overcrowding is likely to be the governing factor. It is possible, however, that if pressures for increasing imprisonment are generated by such policies, increased use will be made of jails to accommodate prison surpluses. Available data described in Chapter II indicate that in many states, jails—particularly those in non-metropolitan areas—still have available unused prisoner capacities.

However, one predictable impact of adoption of these policies would be to reduce parole workloads or—at the extreme—to even eliminate the need for the parole function, as indicated by the following assessment by the Council of State Governments.

> No formalized post-release supervision will be provided in either Maine or Illinois. It is anticipated in Maine that work release and other temporary release programs will be more intensively and extensively employed to facilitate an offender's reintegration into the community, thus rendering any parole supervision a duplicate and unnecessary service. In Illinois, it is envisioned that post-release reintegrative programs and services will be available on a voluntary basis for ex-offenders. Parole caseworkers will be redeployed to provide post-release services as well as to serve as staff for a statewide probation system to be administered by the Department of Corrections.[21]

4. *Mandatory minimum sentences*. A closely-related sentencing reform, which has been actively supported by the Federal Government, would require the imposition of mandatory minimum sentences for certain categories of offenses or offenders. This was one of the major recommendations in President Ford's Crime Message to the Congress in 1975. Noting that a large proportion of individuals convicted of felonies, including repeat offenders, are not actually imprisoned, President Ford recommended that, in the case of federal offenses, incarceration be made mandatory for: "(1) offenders who commit violent offenses under Federal jurisdiction using a

dangerous weapon; (2) persons committing such extraordinarily serious crimes as aircraft hijacking, kidnapping, and trafficking in hard drugs; and (3) repeat offenders who commit federal crimes—with or without a weapon—that cause or have a potential to cause personal injury."[22] The President also called upon the states to establish similar mandatory sentencing policies.

Among the apparent consequences of adoption of such policies would be: an increase in the number of individuals assigned to prisons, rather than probation; and a corresponding reduction in probation work loads. Any precise estimate of impacts would, however, require specific analysis, for each affected offender category, of the difference in imprisonment rates before any after imposition of these policies, of the average length of imprisonment in each case, and of the possible interaction between mandatory sentencing requirements and the number of individuals convicted for such offenses, either through trial or plea bargaining procedures. These related variables are bound to be influenced, to some extent, by the availability of manpower in the courts and prosecutor agencies to handle increased trial workloads and by the availability of prison capacity to handle an increased number of intakes to the prison system, unless offset by compensating reductions in average length of imprisonment for all inmates.

The many uncertainties related to an assessment of these impacts are illustrated by experience under the mandatory prison requirement for certain offenders, enacted in New York State in 1973. This legislation imposed plea bargaining restrictions and mandatory prison sentences on offenders convicted of certain drug felonies and on all second felony offenders. A preliminary report by the Drug Law Evaluation Project of the New York City Bar Association, based on two years of experience under this law, found that one effect of the law was to significantly raise the demand for trials in drug-felony and "second offender" cases with resulting increases in case backlogs. The result was a sharp reduction in drug cases processed and in drug convictions in the two years following passage of the law. The likelihood of a prison sentence following arrest increased, for drug felonies, in only two of the seven jurisdictions studied (including New York City), but did not increase in any of the jurisdictions for other felonies. Although the new drug laws may have facilitated enforcement by providing greater incentives to offenders to provide information to the police, there was no evidence during this initial period of any significant reduction in either drug crimes or drug usage attributable to the new law.[23]

The generally negative results of this policy, to date, may—of course—be attributable to the limited period of time that the New York law has been in operation. This experience does, however, confirm earlier observations that a "tougher" policy on imprisonment of offenders can only be implemented if additional resources are provided to both correctional institutions and to other agencies, e.g., courts and prosecutors, which have the responsibility of implementing these policies. If these policies do prove to have the desired deterrent effect there may be some offsetting savings resulting from reduced crime rates. However, the latter could only be expected to materialize over some longer-term period, if at all.

F. Conclusions

The projections of correctional manpower needs presented in this chapter have been based on a number of major assumptions concerning future trends and policies, which will affect the flow of offenders into and through the correctional system. Some of these assumed trends will operate to slow down the flow into the correctional system—notably the projected decline in crime rates during the period 1980–85. However, recent experience indicates that changes in correctional strategies—particularly in the degree of emphasis placed upon imprisonment, as against non-residential programs—will have a much greater impact upon correctional manpower needs than will the trends in crime rates or of convictions for crime. This is due to the fact that institutionalization of offenders is much more labor intensive and costly than is supervision of offenders by probation or parole agencies or in community-based facilities. For this reason, too, future trends in state and local budgets, and in the readiness of state legislatures to allocate additional funds for such programs as new prison construction, can have a very critical influence upon the trend in correctional employment.

From this standpoint, a major influence upon future correctional manpower needs appears to be an emerging public policy placing greater emphasis upon institutional confinement of serious adult offenders, which has been reflected in the rapid growth in state prison populations. Thus, in contrast to a projected slowdown in growth of crime and arrest rates, the number of prisoners in state institutions is expected to increase from 190,000 in 1974 to 243,000 in 1980, and to 252,000 in 1985. As a result, total employment in adult correctional institutes is expected to increase by about 58 percent between 1974 and 1985.

In contrast, the outlook for juvenile corrections suggests a continued movement away from large state institutions, towards community-based residential and non-residential programs. This trend, in combination with the projected decline in the proportion of teenaged youth in the population, will result in a relatively small net increase of 12 percent in total employment in juvenile institutions, entirely at the local level.

Employment in probation and parole agencies, which are responsible for supervising a very large proportion of the population under correctional control, is expected to continue to grow at a substantially more rapid rate than other categories of correctional agencies. Based on recent trends, our projections indicate that the number of employees in these agencies will more than double between 1974 and 1985, in view of continued growth in the number of convictions and of pressures to provide closer supervision to probationers and parolees.

The inherent uncertainties in any long-term projections of correctional manpower needs were illustrated by our assessment of several recent trends impinging on the correctional system. One of these trends, the movement from large state correctional institutions to community-based facilities, had been widely heralded in the literature on correctional reform. Our assessment indicates, however, that—although this trend has been pronounced in the case of juvenile corrections—it has played a relatively limited role in the case of adult inmates, partly because of strong community resistance. Conversely, the trends towards fixed and mandatory minimum sentences—which might imply a very rapid increase in imprisonment of adult offenders—appear, based on very preliminary evidence, to force a reduction in the length of sentences in part because of the limited capacity of prisons to absorb massive increases in numbers of inmates. Thus, although pressures for these policies are likely to continue, a relatively moderate growth in imprisonment, combined with continued heavy reliance upon non-residential supervision, appears to be the more realistic outlook.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Peter Morrison, *Demographic Factors That Will Shape Future Housing Demand* (The Rand Corporation, 1976).
2. U.S. Crime Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reports* (1975).
3. Gettinger, Steve, "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-Time High." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (March 1976): 3–8.
4. The Director of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture has estimated that the cost of modernizing or replacing all existing state facilities to meet prescribed standards could alone range between 12 and 18 billion in the next 15 years, without any allowance for expansion of prison capacity. (Based on telephone interview, October 27, 1976).
5. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *Children in Custody* (1971 and 1973).
6. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967), pp. 170 and 171.
7. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (1967), p. 38.
8. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections* (1973), pp. 349–352.
9. Robert D. Vintner, George Downs, and John Hall, *Juvenile Corrections in the States: Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization: A Preliminary Report* (University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, November 1975), p. 31.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
11. Serrill, Michael S., "Juvenile Corrections in Massachusetts." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (November/December 1975): 3.
12. Vintner, *et al.*, p. 50.
13. Serrill, Michael S., "Harvard Recidivism Study." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (November/December 1975): 21–23.
14. Vintner, *et al.*, p. 68.
15. U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *Census of State Correctional Facilities, Advance Report* (1974), p. 14.
16. Swanson, Richard M., *Work Release: Toward an Understanding of the Law, Policy and Operations of Community-Based State Corrections* (Southern Illinois University, 1973), p. 10.
17. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Corrections*.
18. Dershowitz, Alan M., "Criminal Sentencing in the United States: An Historical and Conceptual Overview." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 423 (January 1976): 128.
19. The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing, *Fair and Certain Punishment* (1976), p. 20.
20. *The New York Times*, October 12, 1976, p. 17.
21. Council of State Governments, *Definite Sentencing: An Examination of Proposals in Four States* (1976), p. 23.
22. President Gerald Ford's Message to Congress, June 1975.
23. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, *The Effects of the 1973 Drug Laws on the New York State Courts* (Drug Abuse Council, Inc., 1976).

CHAPTER IV. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF CORRECTIONS EMPLOYEES

A. Introduction

Personnel problems resulting from difficulties in recruiting qualified personnel, from high turnover rates, and from inadequate representation of minorities and women on correctional staffs, were highlighted in the reports of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in the late 1960's.[1]

To assess the current extent of these problems, the National Manpower Survey included a number of questions relevant to personnel recruitment and turnover in its surveys of correctional executives, as well as in its field visits. The results are reviewed in the first section of this chapter. The second section presents projections of recruitment needs for line correctional personnel for the period 1974–85. The third section reviews trends in employment and recruitment of minorities and women, and analyzes their current occupational distribution.

B. Recent Recruitment and Turnover Experience

1. *Survey results*. The National Manpower Survey was conducted during a period when the economy was experiencing higher rates of unemployment than at any time since the 1930's. Under these conditions, it was assumed that problems of recruitment and retention of correctional personnel would be relatively slight, as compared with those which had existed or might be expected under more favorable labor market conditions.

The survey results generally confirmed this assumption. Less than 10 percent of correctional executives indicated that, at the time of the survey, a lack of qualified applicants was a major factor contributing to current personnel shortages. However, even under these conditions, it is noteworthy that about 1 of 10 administrators of adult institutions, and 1 of 8 administrators of juvenile institutions, did identify high personnel turnover as "their most serious manpower problem," rather than other possible responses, such as an inadequate number of authorized positions or inadequate staff training. Field interviews conducted among correctional officials in 10 states in late 1975 and early 1976 also indicated that the supply of applicants was generally adequate at that time, but reflected more concern about personnel turnover. The NMS field report on adult corrections institutions notes that: "Even with the current economic recession, turnover for the correctional officer position was reported as high enough to be troublesome by all of the states in the sample."[2] The report for juvenile corrections, however, notes that: "Turnover for houseparents is lower now than in previous years. Strains in the economy have reduced movement within the usually volatile position of houseparent."[3]

In anticipation of this situation, the NMS questionnaires also requested that correctional executives

Table IV–1

Percent of Agency Executives Reporting Recruitment and Turnover Problems in Key Occupations During 1971–74

Type of Agency/Occupation	Percent Reporting Inadequate Supply of Qualified Applicants	Percent Reporting Significant Problem of Voluntary Resignations	
		Critical or Serious Problem	Moderate Problem
Adult Institutions:			
Correctional officers	42	31	22
Educational personnel	20	4	11
Treatment personnel	28	4	19
Medical personnel	56	29	17
Juvenile Institutions:			
Child care workers and staff supervisors	34	20	19
Educational personnel	15	5	7
Treatment personnel	23	11	11
Medical personnel	18	6	5
Probation and parole officers	24	12	15

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

assess the adequacy of manpower supply for their agencies and the severity of their personnel turnover problems in the years immediately preceding the recession, i.e., 1971–74 (see Table IV–1). The responses indicated significant differences in the extent of recruitment and retention difficulties for various categories of correctional personnel.

For adult correctional agencies, medical personnel and correctional officers were most frequently cited as posing serious recruitment and retention problems. Over one-half of the wardens (56 percent) reported an inadequate supply of medical personnel, and over two-fifths, an inadequate supply of applicants for correctional officer positions. Approximately one-half of the respondents also indicated that they had experienced serious or moderate problems as a result of personnel turnover in these occupations. Much lower proportions of respondents indicated similar difficulties with respect to treatment and educational personnel.

- Among juvenile institutions, the frequency of reported recruitment and turnover problems was lower than for adult institutions in all occupational categories. Child care workers were most frequently identified as posing recruitment and turnover problems among the four major occupational categories.
- In the case of probation and parole agencies, the extent of reported recruitment and turnover problems was significantly lower than in the line positions of the correctional agencies. Nearly one-fourth, however, reported an inadequate supply of qualified applicants, prior to the recession, and slightly over one-fourth indicated that they had experienced serious or moderate problems due to voluntary resignations of probation or parole officers.
- The actual personnel turnover rates of personnel in FY 1974, are shown in Table IV–2 for three key correctional occupations: custodial officers in state adult institutions, child care workers, and probation and parole officers. Voluntary resignations, or quit rates, averaged 19 percent for custodial officers, 27 percent for child care workers and about 13 percent for probation and parole officers for the agencies reporting these data.

Hiring rates, in the same year, were significantly higher for all three occupational categories, reflecting agency needs for employment growth, as well as for personnel replacements. These rates, when related to aggregate employment estimates for each of these occupations, corresponded to a total volume of new hires in FY 1974 of 13,400 custodial officers in state institutions, 6,000 child care workers, and 4,800 probation and parole officers.

Personnel turnover rates, as indicated in Table IV–2, tended to vary inversely with agency size. This pattern was most pronounced in the case of probation and parole officers, whose quit rates averaged 20.3 percent of agencies with fewer than 10 employees, nearly twice as great as the rate of 10.7 percent among officers in agencies with 150 or more employees.

The above rates confirm the existence of significant personnel retention problems among line custodial officers and child care workers prior to the recent recession. They can be contrasted with much lower personnel turnover rates among federal correctional officers and for sworn police officers in state

Table IV–2

Personnel Turnover Rates in Selected Correctional Occupations, by Size of Agency, Fiscal Year 1974

Agency Size	Correctional Officers, State Institutions			Child Care Workers			Probation and Parole Workers		
	N[b]	Hiring Rate	Quit Rate	N[b]	Hiring Rate	Quit Rate	N[b]	Hiring Rate	Quit Rate
Total[a]	**(156)**	**32.1**	**19.1**	**(469)**	**33.6**	**27.2**	**(1,466)**	**21.5**	**12.8**
400 or more employees	(25)	34.8	19.0	(34)	34.5	26.1	(48)	18.9	10.7
150–399	(51)	27.3	17.3						
75–149	(31)	27.1	20.4	(65)	29.7	26.0	(56)	21.4	13.1
25–74	(34)	47.0	28.1	(148)	33.3	27.0	(204)	21.0	14.8
10–24	(15)	40.9	19.9	(133)	38.5	32.7	(401)	27.1	17.0
Less than 10				(89)	51.6	38.3	(757)	35.2	20.3

[a] Hiring and quit rates based on weighted averages.

[b] Number of responses.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

and local agencies for the same period. Thus, as compared with the voluntary resignation rate of 19.1 percent for correctional officers in state institutions in FY 1974, the Bureau of Prisons experienced a separation rate for all causes of only 8.8 percent among federal correctional officers.[4] The police officer quit rate in state and local agencies was 8.1 percent, and was only about half as great (about 4 percent) for police officers in agencies with 400 or more employees. The quit rate of deputy sheriffs, many of whom are assigned to correctional duties, more closely approximated that of custodial officers. It averaged 16.2 percent for all sheriffs' agencies, but was only 5.2 percent in agencies with 400 or more employees.

The above findings can also be compared with those of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, based on surveys of correctional agencies conducted in 1967. The two sets of survey results are not precisely comparable because of differences in survey design. However, the comparisons in Table IV–3 do suggest a considerable easing of the labor supply situation, with respect to treatment and training specialists, between the periods of the two surveys. Thus, the proportion of adult correctional administrators reporting difficulties in or retention of treatment and training personnel was less than half as great in the NMS survey (with respect to 1971–74 experience) than in the earlier 1967 survey. Very little improvement had apparently occurred, however, in the capabilities of individual agencies to recruit and retain line custodial personnel. The proportions of administrators reporting difficulties in recruitment of correctional officers declined by only one-fifth, from 53 percent to 42 percent between the two survey periods, while a nearly identical proportion reported retention problems for correctional officers in both surveys (52 percent in 1967, 53 percent in 1971–74).

The above comparisons are also quite consistent with changes in the overall labor market situation between 1967 and the 1971–74 period. During the late 1960's, college-trained personnel with backgrounds appropriate for specialized treatment or training positions in correctional institutions were generally in short supply. By the early 1970's, the labor market for college graduates had dramatically reversed. Overall demand for new entrants into professional jobs had sharply declined, particularly in the teaching profession. At the same time, the number of new college graduates continued to grow each year. As a result, unemployment rates for college graduates rose significantly, and increasing numbers of college graduates were compelled to accept or to continue in less desirable jobs.[5]

Table IV–3

Percent of Correctional Administrators Reporting Recruitment and Retention Problems in Key Occupations, in Joint Commission Survey for 1967 and in National Manpower Survey for 1971–74

Type of Agency and Occupation	Joint Commission Survey (1967)[a]		NAMS Survey (1971–74 experience)[b]	
	Recruitment Problems	Retention Problems	Recruitment Problems	Retention Problems
Adult Institutions:				
Correctional officers	53	52	42	53
Treatment personnel	60	40	28	23
Training personnel			20	15
Juvenile Institutions:				
Child care workers	51	50	34	39
Treatment personnel	65	43	23	22
Training personnel	41	27	15	12

[a] Source: *A Time to Act, Final Report of Joint Commissio on Correctional Manpower and Training*, 1969, p. 13 and supplementary unpublished materials.

[b] Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Percent with retention problems is total of responses indicating "critical or serious problem" and "moderate problem."

The more limited improvement in the recruitment situation for line personnel indicated by the above comparisons is consistent with: a general easing of the labor supply situation for all workers following the 1960's, as illustrated by the increase in the unemployment rate from 3.6 percent in 1967 to an average of 5.4 percent during the 1971–74 period,[6] and the reduced demand for employees in state-operated juvenile institutions during the 1970's as a result of the sharp reduction in the number of juvenile inmates.

The continuation of significant retention problems for both correctional officers and child care workers during the early 1970's is further illustrated by a comparison of separation rates in these occupations, based on the two surveys. In 1967, the separation rate for all causes among non-supervisory correctional officers in adult institutions was 22.6 percent, according to results of the Joint Commission survey. This compares with an estimated average voluntary resignation or quit rate of 19.1 percent in 1974 for all correctional officers, based on the NMS results. Since the latter rate excludes separations due to such causes as deaths and retirements (estimated at 1.5 percent) and refers to all correctional officers, including supervisors—whose turnover is normally lower—the comparison suggests little net change in the high rate of turnover among custodial personnel between these two periods. Similarly, the quit rate of 27.2 percent for child care workers in 1974, based on the NMS, can be compared with a total separation rate among child care workers, or "cottage parents," of 28.3 percent in 1967, as reported in the Joint Commission survey.

2. *Factors affecting personnel turnover*. The persistence of high rates of personnel turnover among line correctional personnel—at least until the recent recession—has had obvious implications for the effectiveness of correctional institutions. One of the concomitants of high turnover is a low average experience level among line personnel—those in day-to-day contact with offenders. The risks of extensive reliance upon inexperienced personnel for these duties are illustrated by the findings of the New York State Commission on the Attica riot which identified the lack of experience of many of the prison's officers as one of the major factors contributing to this disastrous riot.[7] Yet, as a result of high turnover and of continued employment growth, the available evidence suggests a significant decline, rather than increase, in experience level of line correctional personnel between 1968 and 1974. In 1968, a sample survey of correctional personnel conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training found that one-half of all correctional line workers (adult and juvenile) had 7.0 years or more of experience in correctional work.[8] In 1974, the median years of service of line correctional officers in adult institutions was 4.8 years, and was 4.2 years for custodial personnel in juvenile institutions, according to the Census Employee Characteristics Survey.[9]

High personnel turnover rates have other adverse effects upon personnel costs and performance. They necessarily increase the costs associated with recruiting and training of personnel. And they are an obvious symptom of low personnel morale.

The 1968 Louis Harris survey of correctional personnel for the Joint Commission included a question concerning reasons for leaving correctional work. Leading the list was "economic reasons, low pay," which was identified by 63 percent of the line workers in the sample. Next in importance, particularly among juvenile workers, were "pressures of the field, lack of success," and lack of advancement opportunities. Additional insights were obtained from related questions concerning aspects of their jobs most liked or disliked by correctional personnel. Low pay was the job aspect most frequently disliked by line personnel. However, next in importance were such factors as "lack of staff," "disorganization," "our failures," and "not being able to meet the needs of offenders," all of which addressed in different ways the frustrations of personnel with the correctional field and their work environment. Thus, both economic factors, such as pay, and intrinsic characteristics of the work itself, appear to have contributed to high personnel turnover.[10]

Since the time of the above survey, there has been some relative improvement in employment conditions of correctional personnel. Thus, between 1967 and 1973, average monthly earnings of full-time correctional employees in state and local agencies rose by 51.3 percent, as compared with smaller increases of 42.8 percent in gross average weekly earnings, and of 46.3 percent in hourly earnings for all non-supervisory or production workers in private non-agricultural establishments.[11] Nevertheless, salary rates of line correctional employees continue substantially below those of line personnel in police and sheriffs' agencies, as indicated by the following comparisons for 1975, based on the NMS surveys.

	*Median Minimum Entry Salary, 1975**
Police officers	$9,914
Deputy sheriffs	9,540
Probation and parole officers	9,533
Correctional officers, adult institutions	8,328
Child care workers, juvenile institutions	7,798

---

* Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

NMS staff field visits also confirm that many of the personnel problems noted in the Joint Commission studies continue to prompt high personnel turnover, as illustrated by the following comments.

Correctional officers, adult institutions. "The majority of the turnover was due to voluntary resignations and the reasons most often cited were lower salaries than other agencies and the tension and overcrowding of institutions. Moreover, the location of institutions far away from urban populations was reported to be a major factor in staff turnover."[12]

Child care workers. "Two primary factors contribute to turnover. One, as could be expected, is the opportunity to get better jobs. The other is the poor career progression available for personnel in key occupations. . .especially for those having positions in institutional facilities. In community-based programs, reasons for turnover tend to be more program specific. The variety of reasons offered includes intensity of the work, lack of regular time off, lack of seeing very many juveniles become successful, disinterest in the program, change in management, and requirement for longer term program commitment by staff than previously."[13]

C. Projected Recruitment Needs

Recruitment needs for correctional personnel in future years will be determined both by trends in personnel turnover, i.e., "replacement needs," and by trends in total requirements for such personnel, i.e., "growth needs." These recruitment needs have been projected in 1985 for three line correctional occupations: correctional officers in state institutions, child care workers, and probation and parole officers (Table IV–4).

As in recent years, a major portion of future recruitment in these occupations will result from the need to replace personnel losses, either because of voluntary resignation, or for such causes as death and retirement. Thus, in FY 1974—a year of relatively rapid growth in correctional employment—replacement needs still accounted for nearly two-thirds of total recruitment needs for correctional officers in state institutions and for probation and parole officers, and for five-sixths of recruitment of child care workers. Moreover, as noted in the preceding chapter, employment growth in correctional agencies is expected to be at a considerably slower rate in the period 1975–85 than in the early 1970, hence increasing the importance of the projection of separation or attrition rates in estimates of future recruitment needs in these occupations.

The largest cause of personnel attrition in line correctional occupations, and the most volatile, has consisted of voluntary resignations or quits. Our estimates of separation rates due to deaths and retirement, based on analyses of the separate age distributions of each occupation and on actuarial estimates of deaths and retirement rates, indicate that loss rates for those causes are likely to range between 1 and 2 percent per year. These contrast with estimated voluntary resignation rates in FY 1974, of 12.8 percent for probation and parole officers, 19.1 percent for correctional officers, and 27.2 percent for child care workers. (For purposes of these projections, it has been assumed that loss rates due to other causes, such as layoffs or dismissals, were insignificant.)

Future rates of voluntary resignation of correctional personnel can be expected to vary with fluctuations in general labor market conditions. Thus, information obtained in the course of field visits to correctional agencies in late 1975 and early 1976 consistently indicated that personnel turnover rates had been substantially reduced from the levels prevailing prior to the recent economic recession. An NMS analysis of quit rates of manufacturing employees for the period 1956–75 has indicated that, on the average, a 10 percent increase in the unemployment rate was accompanied by an 8 percent reduction in the quit rate. Since the average levels of unemployment rates projected for the period 1974–80 have been assumed to be substantially higher than those experienced in FY 1974, corresponding reductions were made in projected voluntary separation rates of line correctional employees based on this relationship. Somewhat higher turnover rates, in turn, were

Table IV–4

Estimated Annual Recruitment Needs in Line Correctional Occupations: Actual, FY 1974; Projected, 1974–80, 1980–85

	Actual Fiscal Year 1974[a]	Projected (Annual Average)[b]	
		1975–80	1980–85
Correctional Officers, State Institutions:			
Average annual employment	41,600	49,200	61,200
Separation rate, total	20.6%	14.4%	17.2%
Voluntary resignation	(19.1)	(12.9)	(15.7)
Other causes	(1.5)	(1.5)	(1.5)
Annual replacement needs	8,600	7,100	10,500
Annual growth needs	4,800	2,400	1,900
Total recruitment needs	13,400	9,500	12,400
Child Care Workers:			
Average annual employment	17,000	18,300	18,900
Separate rate, total	29.0	20.2	25.1
Voluntary resignations	(27.2)	(18.4)	(22.3)
Other causes	(1.8)	(1.8)	(1.8)
Annual replacement needs	5,200	3,700	4,600
Annual growth needs	800	200	100
Total recruitment needs	6,000	3,900	4,700
Probation and Parole Officers:			
Average annual employment	22,500	26,200	32,000
Separation rate, total	13.9	9.8	11.6
Voluntary resignations	(12.8)	(8.7)	(10.5)
Other causes	(1.1)	(1.1)	(1.1)
Annual replacement needs	3,100	2,600	3,700
Annual growth needs	1,700	1,200	900
Total recruitment needs	4,800	3,800	4,600

[a] Source: Voluntary Resignation Rates from NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Death and Retirement Rates derived from estimates by age group from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Length of Working Life for Men and Women," BLS Bulletin 197, 1970.

[b] Source: NPA Projections, 1976.

projected for the period 1980–85, based on the assumed reduction in unemployment during this period, but these are still expected to be lower, on the average, than during FY 1974.

The resulting projections, as shown in Table IV–4, indicated a sharp reduction in annual recruitment needs for all three line correctional occupations during the 1975–80 period, as compared with FY 1974. The reduction will be proportionately greatest (35 percent) in the case of child case workers, as a result of the very limited net employment growth expected in this occupation. Recruitment needs for correctional officers are projected to decline by 29 percent, from about 13,400 in FY 1974, to an average of 9,500 per year during 1975–80. Recruitment of probation and parole officers will decline from 4,800 in FY 1974, to an average of 3,800 during 1975–80-or by 21 percent. This lesser decline in recruitment needs is due to the continued high rate of employment growth projected for probation and parole personnel, and to the lower rates of personnel turnover in this occupation.

Despite a lower expected employment growth rate for 1980–85, recruitment needs in all three of these correctional occupations are projected to increase, as a result of the assumed increase in personnel turnover under improving labor market conditions. However, these needs would still be significantly below those estimated for FY 1974 in the case of child care workers and correctional officers, and would approximately equal the FY 1974 level for probation and parole officers.

These projections, on balance, suggest a generally favorable recruitment climate for correctional agencies during the coming 10-year period, particularly when allowance is made for the continued growth in the Nation's labor force and for the rising educational level of new labor force entrants. These agencies may therefore be in a position to be more selective in personnel recruitment standards, and with the prospect of a more stable work force, may be able to place greater emphasis upon the quality of both entry-level and in-service training.

D. Employment and Recruitment of Minorities and Women

Employment discrimination against individuals on grounds of race, ethnic affiliation, religion, or sex contravenes federal laws and regulations. In addition, recent assessments of the problems of correctional institutions have concluded that the gross disparity between the racial composition of inmate populations, which has consisted predominantly of blacks or other minorities in many institutions, and of the custodial force, which has been predominantly white, has contributed to inmate-guard tensions and conflicts. Thus, the 1973 report of a Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives noted that while 63 percent of the inmate population at Attica had consisted of minority group members (including about 55 percent blacks, 7 percent Puerto Ricans and 0.5 percent "other"), only a small number of black guards had jobs at Attica.[14] The report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and the earlier report of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, both recommended increased recruitment of minority group members for all correctional positions.[15] These reports also noted a prevailing pattern of exclusion of women from correctional institutions for males, except in clerical or similar positions, and their underrepresentation generally in higher level administrative positions.[16]

1. *Trends in employment of minorities and women in line correctional positions.* In order to assess recent trends in employment of minorities and women in correctional activities, and the extent of their current employment, data have been compiled from several sources:

- The occupational statistics of the decennial Censuses of Population for 1960 and 1970 report employment for the occupation of "guards and watchmen." This category includes individuals employed in such capacities as building guards or watchmen, as well as those working as correctional officers or as cottage parents in juvenile institutions. Special tabulations were prepared, based on the Census public-use sample tapes of guards and watchmen, employed in state and local agencies. A comparison with available estimates of total custodial officer employment in state and local institutions for 1970 suggests that over 60 percent of the total number included in the Census report in that year were probably correctional personnel, exclusive of sheriffs. As shown in Table IV-5, the percentage of blacks employed as guards in state and local agencies increased from 6.6 percent in 1960 to 10.7 percent in 1970. The percentage of women in this occupation rose from 5.8 to 8.8 percent over the same period.

The only other available estimate of the percentage of black officers among line custodial personnel during the 1960's is based on a small scale survey of correctional personnel conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in 1967. The latter survey resulted in an estimate of 9 percent for blacks in line correctional jobs.[17]

- Reports by state and local governments to the EEOC under the provisions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1973, provide more comprehensive data on employment of minorities and women in correctional agencies, although they still fall short of a complete census. These statistics indicate that blacks comprised 15.4 percent of "protective service" workers in correctional agencies in 1973 and 17.7 percent in 1974. This occupational group corresponds to the line correctional officer position in state institutions and jails and probably also includes some individuals employed as "cottage parents" or "child care" personnel in juvenile institutions. Spanish-Americans comprised about 3 percent of this occupational group in both 1973 and 1974, while the proportion of women reported in this category was 9.3 percent in 1973 and 9.8 percent in 1974.
- A final data source available for these comparisons is the Census Employee Characteristics Survey. The proportions of blacks and of women classified as "line custodial personnel" in the latter report as of October 1974, as shown in Table IV-5, were somewhat higher than the corresponding percentages from the EEOC reports for 1974. This is probably due in part to differences in occupational classifications, particularly in the case of child care workers employed in juvenile institutions. It is possible that some of the personnel in this occupation (which includes a relatively large ratio of black and female personnel), were classified as custodial personnel under the NMS occupational code, but may have been included in other occupational categories in the reports to the EEOC.

Table IV–5

Percent of Minorities Employed in Line Custodial Positions in State and Local Correctional Institutions, Selected Years: 1960–74

Data Source/Occupation/year	Percent Minorities		
	Percent Black	Percent Spanish-American	Percent Women
Census of Population, ''Guards and Watchmen[a]:			
1960	6.6[b]:	N.A.	5.8
1970	10.7	2.0	8.8
EEOC Reports, "Protective Service Workers"[c]:			
1973	15.4	2.9	9.3
1974	17.7	3.1	9.8
Census Employee Characteristics Survey, "Line Custodial Workers"[d]:			
1974—Total	19.4	2.9	14.0
Adult institutions	17.8	2.6	7.5
Juvenile institutions[e]:	32.4	2.7	33.7
Sheriffs jails	13.3	3.8	17.3

[a] Source: Based on special tabulations of public-use sample tapes for state and local employees from the 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Population.

[b] Defined as "non-whites."

[c] Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO–4 Reports, 1974. Includes state, county, and municipal employees.

[d] Source: Based on NMS tabulations from Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974. Excludes custodial supervisors.

[e] Based on responses indicating that employee has contact with juveniles as part of custodial duties.

With the exception of the direct comparisons of EEOC reports for 1973 and 1974, the above data do not permit a definitive measurement of the trend in minority or female employment among line correctional personnel. However, these statistics do suggest that affirmative action programs, as well as general labor market conditions, have probably contributed to significant increases in employment of both minorities and women in line correctional positions during the period under review.

2. *Comparisons with racial characteristics of inmates*. One possible standard for assessing the current adequacy of minority representation among line correctional personnel is to compare these proportions with the proportion of minorities among inmates. This is consistent with the concept of a "service population" in the LEAA guideline on affirmative action programs, the effect of which is ". . . to indicate to the recipient agency that it should consider the population it serves as a basis for determining how well it is doing in its equal opportunity efforts."[18] For this purpose, Table IV-6 shows comparisons, by state, of the percentage of blacks holding custodial officer positions in state prisons, as reported to EEOC, with the percentage of blacks among the inmates of these prisons. It will be apparent that none of the 41 state prison systems for which such data are available had approached "parity" between the racial composition of their guard force and that of their inmates. Among 17 reporting state systems with large proportions of black inmates, i.e., 40 percent or more, only 5 states—South Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and Arkansas—reported percentages of black custodial officers which were one-half or more of the corresponding percentage of black inmates.

Table IV–6

Blacks as Percent of Custodial Officers and of Inmate Populations in State Prisons for Selected States, by LEAA Region, 1973–74

State	Percent Black Custodial Officers, 1974[a]	Percent Black Inmates, 1973[b]
Region I;		
Maine	0.0	2.0
Vermont	0.0	0.4
Region II		
New Jersey	25.6	49.7[c]
New York	20.3	58.3
Region III:		
Delaware	38.0	60.1
Maryland	42.7	74.0
Pennsylvania	10.2	56.5
Virginia	13.9	59.3
West Virginia	0.8	15.3
Region IV:		
Florida	8.5	56.2
Georgia	6.7	63.5
Kentucky	4.8	26.9
Mississippi	27.1	63.0
North Carolina	16.0	54.0
South Carolina	40.8	58.6[c]
Region V:		
Illinois	23.7	57.5
Indiana	13.2	41.4
Michigan	5.9	58.5
Minnesota	0.0	16.1
Wisconsin	1.4	30.1
Region VI:		
Arkansas	33.3	47.6
Louisiana	15.8	71.1
New Mexico	0.0	11.6
Oklahoma	11.4	26.3
Texas	4.9	43.4
Region VII:		
Iowa	0.9	19.1
Kansas	6.7	31.7
Nebraska	9.3	29.7
Region VIII:		
Colorado	3.2	19.3
Montana	0.0	1.6
North Dakota	0.0	1.8
South Dakota	0.0	1.9
Utah	0.4	9.2
Wyoming	0.0	4.2
Region IX:		
Arizona	4.0	21.5
California	11.7	31.8
Nevada	1.0	21.8
Region X:		
Alaska	0.0	16.0
Idaho	1.6	1.0
Oregon	2.7	13.3
Washington	2.8	17.4

[a] Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO–4 Report, 1974.

[b] Source: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, Unpublished Reports. States for which either percent of Black custodial officers or Black inmates were not available, were omitted.

[c] Includes "other races."

In the case of women in correctional officer positions, the equal employment opportunity issue has been posed in a different form—namely, opposition to the prevailing pattern of limiting the role of women officers mainly to supervision of female or juvenile inmates, and to "non-contact" roles in adult male institutions, for example, in inspection of female visitors to prisons. The available statistics from the Census Employee Characteristics Survey do indicate that a relatively large proportion (33.7 percent) of custodial personnel in contact with juveniles are women, as compared to much smaller proportions of women in adult institutions (7.5 percent) or in sheriffs' jails (17.3 percent)—the latter including detention facilities for both adults and juveniles. In the case of adult institutions other than jails, the proportion of women reported as in line correctional functions of 7.5 percent is more than twice as great as the proportion of women inmates of 3.2 percent in 1973.[19] Some states, notably California, have recently initiated a policy of utilization of women as officers in male institutions.[20] However, the available data do not permit a separate analysis of staffing ratios for male and female institutions.

3. *Occupational distribution of minorities and women in corrections.* Thus far, our analysis has focused on the extent of employment of minorities and women in the line correctional positions, in view of the strong policy emphasis on obtaining adequate representation—particularly of minorities—in those positions which are in day-to-day contact with the offender population. Affirmative action programs are, of course, concerned with equitable opportunities for access to all correctional jobs, including those at the higher ranks of the occupational ladder. In this respect, the available statistics indicate that both minority workers and women are disproportionately concentrated in the lower paid, lower status positions of correctional agencies.

The broad occupational distribution of state and local correctional employees in each major race or ethnic group is shown in Table IV-7, based on EEOC reports for 1974. Of particular interest is the relative concentration of minority group members in each occupation group—for example, comparison of their share of higher-level positions, such as officials and administrators, with their overall representation in the agencies' work force. Based on this criterion, minority group members were generally underrepresented in the higher level managerial and professional positions. Thus while all minority group members accounted for 20.6 percent of total employment in these agencies, they held 11.4 percent of the administrative positions and 14.2 percent of the profes-

Table IV–7

Persons Employed in Corrections Agencies by Race/Ethnic Group and Occupation Group, 1974

Occupation	Total		White			Black			Spanish-Origin			Other Races		
	Number	Percent Distrib.	Number	Percent Distrib.	Percent of Total	Number	Percent Distrib.	Percent of Total	Number	Percent Distrib.	Percent of Total	Number	Percent Distrib.	Percent of Total
Total	**164,516**	**100.0**	**130,556**	**100.0**	**79.4**	**26,670**	**100.0**	**16.2**	**5,351**	**100.0**	**3.3**	**1,939**	**100.0**	**1.2**
Officials/Administrators	6,695	4.1	5,919	4.5	88.4	620	2.3	9.3	93	1.7	1.4	63	3.2	0.9
Professionals	36,616	22.3	31,048	23.8	84.8	4,254	16.0	11.6	868	16.2	2.4	446	23.0	1.2
Technicians	6,564	4.0	5,076	3.9	77.3	1,036	3.9	15.8	358	6.7	5.5	94	4.8	1.4
Protective service (e.g., guards, cottage parents)	61,269	37.2	47,993	36.8	78.3	10,877	40.8	17.8	1,908	35.7	3.1	491	25.3	0.8
Para-professionals	17,768	10.8	11,145	8.5	62.7	5,407	20.3	30.4	855	16.0	4.8	362	18.7	2.0
Office clerical	22,441	13.6	18,753	14.4	83.6	2,550	9.6	11.4	781	14.6	3.5	357	18.4	1.6
Skilled crafts	5,650	3.4	5,067	3.9	89.7	426	1.6	7.5	122	2.3	2.2	35	1.8	0.6
Maintenance	7,512	4.6	5,555	4.3	74.0	1,500	5.6	20.0	366	6.8	4.9	91	4.7	1.2

Note: Percentage detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.
Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO–4 Reports, 1974.

Table IV–8

Persons Employed in Correctional Agencies, by Occupation and Sex: 1974

Occupation	Total, Both Sexes	Men			Women		
		Number	Percent Distribution	Percent of Total	Number	Percent Distribution	Percent of Total
Total	**164,513**	**116,541**	**100,0**	**70.8**	**47,972**	**100.0**	**29.2**
Officials/Administrators	6,696	5,903	5.1	88.2	793	1.7	11.8
Professionals	36,616	27,508	23.6	75.1	9,108	19.0	24.9
Technicians	6,564	5,369	4.6	81.8	1,195	2.5	18.2
Protective services	61,268	55,260	47.4	90.2	6,008	12.5	9.8
Para-professionals	17,767	9,792	8.4	55.1	7,975	16.6	44.9
Office clerical	22,441	2,507	2.2	11.2	19,934	41.6	88.8
Skilled crafts	5,650	5,258	4.5	93.1	392	0.8	6.9
Maintenance	7,511	4,944	4.2	65.8	2.567	5.4	34.2

Note: Percentage detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.
Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO–4 Reports, 1974.

sional level positions. Minority group members also held only 10.3 percent of the skilled crafts jobs in these agencies. In the case of office clerical jobs, black workers held a lower-than-proportionate share of the jobs in this occupation, while Spanish-American origin workers and members of other races held somewhat higher proportions of these positions than their overall share of total correctional employment. In contrast, minority group members generally held a relatively large proportion of the low-skilled maintenance jobs (26.0 percent) and of the paraprofessional jobs (37.3 percent).

The occupational distribution of women (Table IV-8), who accounted for about 29 percent of the total correctional work force, shows a similar pattern of concentration in lower-level positions, but with obvious differences associated with the traditional concentrations of women in lower-paid white collar occupations and in routine service-type occupations. Thus, nearly 42 percent of all women correctional employees in state and local correctional agencies were in office clerical jobs, and they constituted 89 percent of the work force in these positions. Women held a relatively large share, too, of the routine maintenance and paraprofessional positions. On the other hand, they held less-than-proportionate shares of managerial and professional-technical jobs as well as those in the line correctional officer positions.

Further data on the extent of representation of both minorities and women in the top executive or administrative positions of correctional agencies are available from the NMS Executive Surveys, conducted in 1975. The EEOC reports, as of 1974, had indicated that minority group members held 11.6 percent of the positions classified as "officials and administrators," and that women held a similar proportion, 11.8 percent. These reports, however, do not differentiate among various categories of correctional agencies. As shown in Table IV-9, the proportions of both minority group members and of women are significantly higher among administrators of juvenile institutions than either among heads of adult institutions or of probation and parole agencies.

Table IV–9

Percent of Minorities and of Women Employed as Administrators of Correctional Institutions and Probation and Parole Agencies: 1975

Type of Agency	Total Minority	Percent Minority Groups		Percent Women
		Black	Other	
Adult corrections	9	7	2	8
Juvenile corrections	13	11	2	13
Probation and parole	4	3	1	8

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Although the above statistics confirm the continued underrepresentation of both minorities and women in correctional executive positions, a comparison with the results of the earlier surveys conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training suggests that progress has occurred. The Harris survey of correctional personnel, conducted for the Joint Commission in 1967, found that only 3 percent of correctional administrators were then black and that only 5 percent were women. The latter statistics are, however, based on relatively small samples and may therefore be subject to relatively large statistical error.

4. *Recruitment of minorities and women*. In addition to the necessarily-limited statistical indicators of trends in employment of minorities and women described in the preceding sections, information on agency recruitment trends was obtained in the course of field visits by NMS staff to correctional agencies in 10 states. All of the states visited indicated that they had adopted affirmative action programs and also reported recent increases in the hiring of minorities and women in their agencies. The most frequently cited obstacle to recruitment of additional minority personnel was the fact that many of the state institutions are in isolated locations. In Texas, for example, correctional facilities cluster about Huntsville, in the eastern part of the state, many miles from the large Mexican-American population concentrated in southern and western Texas. In many other states, the rural location of facilities has made them inaccessible to many potential black staff members living in cities. One state visited has attempted to overcome this problem by paying relocation expenses of such recruits.

The extent to which increases in representation of these groups on correctional staffs can be accomplished depends, of course, both on their rate of recruitment and their turnover rates. Statistics on personnel turnover rates of correctional officers were compiled for FY 1974, based on data for 3,399 jurisdictions which had reported correctional employment data to EEOC in both 1973 and 1974 (Table IV-10). The results indicate that 27.4 percent of all new hires to custodial officer positions in these agencies in FY 1974 were minority group members, whereas these groups held 22.9 percent of the total custodial officer jobs. Moreover, attrition rates among minority group custodial officers (particularly blacks) were significantly lower in these agencies than among whites. Thus, both increased hiring and higher rates of retention were contributing to an increase in the proportion of minority group members.

In the case of women custodial officers, the new hiring rate in FY 1974 of 9.7 percent was approximately the same as their share of total custodial officer employment. Women custodial personnel, however, had experienced substantially lower attrition rates than had men (13.8 percent as compared to 22.5 percent), thus contributing to an increase in their share of total custodial positions in these agencies.

Table IV–10

Recruitment and Retention of Custodial Officers, by Race/Ethnic Group and by Sex, 1973–74[a]

Race/Ethnic Group and Sex	Percent of Total Employment	Percent of New Hires	Attrition Rate
Race/Ethnic Group:			
White	77.1	72.6	24.7
Black	18.8	21.8	8.3
Spanish-American	3.3	4.6	22.3
Other	0.7	0.9	24.8
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	—
Sex:			
Male	90.2	90.3	22.5
Female	9.8	9.7	13.8
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	—

[a] Source: Based on analysis of matched sample of EEO–4 reports for 3,399 state and county jurisdictions concerning 50,866 correctional employees in "protective service" occupations. Attrition rates derived from matched reports of net employment growth and hires for each group between 1973 and 1974. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO–4 Reports, 1974.

Note: Detail may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

It should be emphasized that the above statistics reflect activity for only one year, 1974, and that the attrition rates shown in Table IV-10 were derived indirectly by matching data from two successive reports. However, if the pattern of lower average attrition rates for both minority group members and women is maintained, it will significantly contribute to a continued growth in their representation in the correctional work force.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act* (1969), pp. 13–20.
2. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, Part 2, p. 341.
3. *Ibid*., p. 469.
4. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, unpublished data for 1974, Personnel Office.
5. U.S. Department of Labor, *Manpower Report of the President, 1972*, pp. 109–10.
6. U.S. Department of Labor, *Employment and Training Report of the President*, 1976, Table A–1.
7. *The Official Report of the New York State Special Commission on Attica*, 1972.
8. *Corrections, 1968: A Climate for Change*. Report of a survey made by Louis Harris and Associates for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training (1968), Table 42.
9. These comparisons overstate the extent of decline, to some extent, since the 1974 Census survey question referred to experience of personnel in their current agency rather than in correctional work as a whole. However, in view of the limited opportunities for mobility of personnel among correctional systems, the difference between average length of total correctional service, and service in the agency of current employment, is probably small for line personnel.

10. *Corrections, 1968*, pp. 34, 39.

11. Average earnings of correctional employees from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Governments, *Public Employment in 1974*. Average earnings of private non-agricultural employees from *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1976, p. 77.

12. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, Part 2, p. 341.

13. *Ibid*., p. 469.

14. *Reform of the Correctional Systems*, A Report by the Select Committee on Crime, June 26, 1973, House Report No. 93–329, 93d Congress, 1st Sess., p. 18.

15. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections*, p. 474; Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act*, 1969, p. 14.

16. National Advisory Commission, p. 476, and *A Time to Act*.

17. *Corrections*, 1968, and *A Climate for Change*, p. 28.

18. U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Equal Opportunity Program Development Manual*, 1974, p. 2.

19. U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA and U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974.

20. Arlene M. Becker, "Women in Corrections: A Process of Change." *Resolution of Correctional Problems and Issues* 1 (Summer 1975): 19–21.

CHAPTER V. EDUCATION FOR CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS

A. Introduction

The educational preparation of personnel has long been a major issue in the American correctional system. Virtually every important study of the system since 1931 has focused on the generally low level of education found among large numbers of correctional personnel and identified it as a primary weakness in the system. However, it is misleading to speak of the educational preparation of correctional personnel in the aggregate. The complexity and diversity of the system—the product of the broad array of programs, institutions, and functions contained within it—has resulted in the juxtaposition of an equally broad array of occupations, each with its own requirements for educational preparation. Within any given institution or agency, it is possible to find occupations that require highly specialized professional degrees, as well as occupations having no apparent educational requirement whatsoever.

Although the complexity of the system is widely recognized the general perception of most commentators has been that, in large part, corrections has been the least educated element of the criminal justice system. The reason for this judgment is clear. The largest single function of the corrections system has been custody, and persons recruited to perform this function have generally come from the less educated segments of the population. Moreover, the frequent practice of promoting only from within the institution, primarily from the custodial ranks, has often served to perpetuate a low level of education throughout the organization, up to and including top administrative positions.

Also frequently identified as reinforcing the low level of educational attainment among correctional personnel is the often remote and predominantly rural setting of major correctional institutions. This, it has been suggested, has reduced the available manpower pool of corrections to that segment of the population with historically lower levels of educational achievement. It has also discouraged educated persons from seeking employment in corrections because of the isolated work setting.

Closely related to this factor have been the other liabilities associated with correctional employment. Poor pay, long hours, poor promotional opportunities, depressing working conditions, and a pervasive reputation for political interference have also discouraged persons whose educational preparation provides them with better options than entering correctional employment.

Recognition of the inadequate educational preparation of correctional personnel has resulted in significant efforts to upgrade their level of preparation. In order to reduce the number of persons in corrections whose educational attainment is considered to be below the minimum required to perform certain occupational functions, efforts have been made to eliminate the hiring and promotional practices that have permitted unqualified persons to enter correctional employment. A major approach has been to adopt or increase educational requirements for initial employment or promotion.

A second approach is the current effort to go beyond minimum educational requirements and to begin to build a more highly educated correctional establishment. Provisions have often been made to offer direct support or encouragement to current personnel to continue their education. The Law Enforcement Educational Program and other federally sponsored programs, as well as those of certain individual states and agencies, have been directed to these ends. Higher education has responded by developing an increasing number of programs planned for the correctional employee.

Current efforts to upgrade the level of education in corrections have raised a number of critical questions. The most obvious question is the ultimate effect of such efforts upon the correctional system. It can be asked whether the efforts have, in fact, had any noticeable impact upon the educational attainment of correctional personnel. Although straightforward in itself, this question can be answered with only a relative degree of precision. Historical data concerning the educational attainment of correctional personnel are both rare and imprecise. Moreover, educational levels in the general population have increased significantly within the last two decades, thus making it more difficult to assess the impact of specific policies upon education in any one occupational sector. Finally, within the correctional system itself, there have been variations in the level of effort made to upgrade the education of personnel, so that no generalized statement concerning ultimate impact can be made.

It may also be asked whether increased education of personnel has had any noticeable impact upon the performance of the system itself. The answer to this question can only be approached in a very tentative manner within the scope of this study. Clearly suggested is the need to determine the actual educational requirements of correctional occupations. This can only be broadly surmised in the absence of a specific examination of all variations to be found in occupational requirements, even within a single occupation. The question is further complicated by a growing concern that fixed educational requirements have potentially discriminatory effects. Finally, in certain instances, occupations in corrections have been or are being restructured and redefined, suggesting that alternative forms of educational preparation may be required.

In summary, the primary focus of this chapter is on the actual levels of education currently evident and on the effects of various efforts to upgrade these levels. Discussion of the relationship between education and performance is confined to existing occupational requirements that suggest the need for certain levels of educational attainment.

The format for this discussion is, first, consideration of the various recognized sources of standards and requirements for educational attainment in several correctional occupations. This is followed by a comparison of these standards with existing levels of education among employees in those positions. On the basis of this comparison, an assessment is made of the relative "gap" between desired and existing levels. In the concluding portion of the chapter, the analysis is expanded to project future levels of education for custodial officers associated with adult insittutions. The occupations to be considered are:

- Adult Corrections Officer
- Juvenile Corrections Child Care Worker
- Probation/Parole Officer
- Institutional Treatment/Educational Employee
- Correctional Line Officer
- Correctional Manager/Administrator

B. Assessment of the Educational Attainment of Correctional Personnel Standards and Levels

1. *Standards for the assessment of the educational attainment of line and supervisory custodial personnel in corrections*. The custodial position in corrections is the most numerous and, in the opinion of many, the most critical with respect to the performance of the system. Standards for the educational attainment of persons in these various occupations tend to reflect the several philosophies existing among correctional practitioners and critics with respect to the way the system should be or is now performing.

Perceptions on this issue can be gleaned from a number of sources, including the various national commissions that have examined the needs of the system, and several national professional associations. In addition to these, it is essential to examine the standards now imposed by state authorities and by individual correctional agencies.

a. *Recommendations of prior studies*. In 1967, the Corrections Task Force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice looked towards changing the correctional system into a force for reducing recidivism and preventing recruitment into criminal careers. It tied this objective to the need for recruiting and retaining qualified staff, believing that, "the main ingredient for changing people is other people."[1]

Although prevailing correctional philosophy has periodically shifted, the core of the correctional officer's role remains custody and security. He observes the inmates throughout the day, conducts searches of inmates and the environment, intervenes in conflicts, responds to emergency situations, and assists inmates in solving problems before they become critical. The extent to which an institution emphasizes a particular correctional goal will influence the type of interaction expected between the officer and the inmate. If the facility emphasizes rehabilitation, the correctional officer will be more likely to be required to assume counseling responsibilities than if the facility emphasizes the custody role. Field interviews with correctional personnel indicate an increasing trend towards including the correctional officer as a part of the treatment team, a practice which would require the development of skills in counseling, crisis intervention, and communication.

If correctional workers are to assume responsibilities as part of the treatment team, the Commission's Task Force on Corrections found it reasonable to require high school graduation as the minimum educational requirement. The Task Force further recommended the establishment of career patterns leading to managerial and specialist positions and recruiting from graduates of 2- and 4-year colleges and universities. They also suggested that increased educational standards were particularly important for supervisors who deal with special kinds of offender populations. Opportunities should be made available so that individuals could continue their formal academic education through programs such as work-study, educational furloughs, and university extension courses.[2]

Other commissions and professional associations supported the establishment of minimum educational standards. The American Correctional Association, although recognizing high school graduation as the usual education requirement, suggested that correctional administrators assist in upgrading educational levels by helping in the development of 2-year undergraduate programs.[3]

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training also recognized high school graduation as the usual requirement for line correctional jobs. It was believed that this requirement was related to the demands of the job which called for stability and technical reading and writing ability. Although certain jobs, such as that of tower guard, make limited demands on an officer's academic abilities, the Joint Commission reasoned that manpower shortages often require rotation among several positions so that any one officer must be capable of assuming more than one post.[4]

Finally, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended that "qualification for correctional staff members be set at the State level and include the requirement of a high school diploma."[5] Although the general tone of the National Advisory Commission was towards improving the quality of personnel, it made no specific recommendations for increasing the generally accepted minimum standard beyond high school graduation.

In general, the recommendations of commissions and professional organizations have agreed upon the high school diploma as an acceptable minimum requirement. However, some standard-setting agencies have encouraged increasing educational levels by recruiting from the ranks of 2-year and 4-year schools or by promoting policies that encourage staff to continue their formal education.

b. *State standards for correctional workers*. In 1967, a survey done for the President's Crime Commission found that 41 percent of the states had not set the minimum educational requirement of a high school diploma recommended by the various commissions. Only 59 percent of the states required high school diplomas or GED for selection as a line correctional worker. No state had progressed beyond the generally accepted high school requirement by setting minimum standards requiring college level work.

Table V-1 summarizes the results of the American Correctional Association survey in 1973. The American Correctional Association found that 80 percent of the 31 states reporting had set minimum standards of a high school diploma. Ten percent of those states still retained standards set at the eighth grade level. Another 10 percent had not included education as a standard in their entrance requirements at all.

c. *Agency standards*. In a survey of executives of adult correctional institutions for the National Manpower Survey, 77 percent of the agencies reported requiring a high school education for selection (see Table V-2). However, 23 percent were not even meeting the minimum educational standard of high school graduation suggested by the National Advisory Commission. Ten percent had not established minimum standards at all, and 12 percent had set standards lower than high school.

Responses from executives of juvenile correctional institutions revealed higher agency standards. Although 19 percent had either not established educational standards or had set standards below the recommended minimum, 28 percent had gone beyond the Commission's recommendation of a high school diploma. Slightly under 18 percent of the agencies responded that some college level work was required for entrance as a line juvenile worker and 11 percent mandated the attainment of a college degree. This may be an indication that the higher standards set by juvenile institutions reflect child care workers as a member of the treatment team, whereas the adult correctional officer's role is more likely to be custody and security.

d. *Occupational requirement and educational standards*. Occupational standards, of whatever character, should necessarily reflect the actual requirements and needs of a given occupation, both as a matter of practicality and, increasingly, as a matter of law. To establish the validity of a given standard requires a relatively elaborate process of assessment generally called occupational analysis. As a part of the NMS assessment of educational and training needs in corrections, an attempt was made to perform a modified occupational analysis of various occupations in corrections. The purpose of this attempt was not to develop a precise or uniformly valid set of standards in training or education, but to provide a general framework against which to assess the broader needs and most common practices of the system. The analysis performed does not purport to

Table V-1
State Educational Requirements for Correctional Officers, 1973

	Education Level	Comments
Alabama	Eighth grade	Experience may substitute
Alaska	—	No information
Arizona	High school	
Arkansas	High school	
California	—	No information
Colorado	No requirement	Must pass examination
Connecticut	High school	
Delaware	High school	Experience may substitute
District of Columbia	—	No information
Florida	—	No information
Georgia	High school	Must complete training
Hawaii	High school	Experience may substitute
Idaho	High school	Plus experience and examination
Illinois	—	No information
Indiana	High school	Experience may substitute
Iowa	—	No information
Kansas	—	No information
Kentucky	Eighth grade	
Louisiana	No requirement	Must pass examination
Maine	—	No information
Maryland	High school	Must pass examination
Massachusetts	—	No information
Michigan	High school	Examination may substitute
Minnesota	No requirement	Experience required
Mississippi	—	No information
Missouri	High school	Or eighth grade plus experience
Montana	High school	Experience required
Nebraska	—	No information
Nevada	—	No information
New Hampshire	High school	
New Jersey	High school	Must complete training program
New Mexico	High school	Experience may substitute
New York	High school	Must pass examination
North Carolina	—	No information
North Dakota	—	No information
Ohio	—	No information
Oklahoma	Eighth grade	Experience may substitute
Oregon	High school	Must pass examination
Pennsylvania	High school	Must pass examination
Rhode Island	High school	Experience required
South Carolina	—	No information
South Dakota	—	No information
Tennessee	High school	Must pass examination
Texas	High school	
Utah	—	No information
Vermont	High school	Experience or further education
Virginia	—	No information
Washington	High school	Experience may substitute
West Virginia	—	No information
Wisconsin	High school	Or attainment of age 18
Wyoming	High school	

Source: American Correctional Association, *Correctional Officer Survey*, 1973.

Table V-2
Current Agency Minimum Educational Requirements

Minimum Education Required	Adult Institution (Percent)	Juvenile Institution (Percent)
No minimum required	10.3	12.1
Less than high school diploma	12.7	7.1
High school diploma	77.0	52.0
1 year of college	0.0	3.1
2 or 3 years of college	0.0	14.8
Bachelor's degree	0.0	0.3
Total	**100.0** (n=213)	**100.0** (n=576)

Source: National Manpower Survey, Executive Survey, 1975.

describe all duties or variations of duties performed by persons in these occupations, nor does it purport to describe precisely the entire set of duties performed within the agencies examined. Rather, it describes what appear to be the most common tasks performed, and in a very general way weighs their relative importance to the occupation. A more complete report of occupational analysis performed by the NMS is contained within Volume VIII of this report. In this chapter only the broader findings of the analysis relating directly to the educational requirements of the occupations will be presented.

As portrayed in the occupational analysis, the primary duties of the correctional custody officer in the adult or juvenile area of corrections are a combination of tasks related only to custody and security tasks and of tasks related to what may be loosely termed the rehabilitative functions of the agency or facility. Chart V-1 presents a listing of the principal tasks performed by adult corrections officers and juvenile corrections child care workers, according to the occupational analysis. The tasks are ordered by two criteria: the proportion of officers performing the tasks and the amount of time spent on the task. On the basis of these criteria, it can be suggested that custody personnel perform tasks related to both custody and rehabilitative functions, but that the primary emphasis is upon custody/security rather than rehabilitation.

In order to relate these tasks to specific educational requirements, incumbent personnel were asked to rank the importance of three areas of preparation—formal education, formal training, and on-the-job training with respect to their learning of the task. In each case, on-the-job training was ranked as the most important source of preparation, followed by formalized training, and finally by formal education.

Incumbent officers were also asked to indicate

Chart V–1

Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Corrections Officers

- Observes and controls movement of inmates in order to prevent disruptions or incidents and accounts for location and movement of inmates.
- Searches inmates, cell blocks, and critical areas in order to detect, collect, and preserve evidence of contraband material.
- Responds to emergency situations in order to minimize adverse outcome of events.
- Advises inmates concerning personal, work, or adjustment problems in order to help them resolve problems.
- Maintains perimeter surveillance to prevent inmate escapes or the introduction of contraband into the facility.
- Assigns tasks to inmates and monitors performance of inmates on assignments.

Source: See Volume VIII, NMS Final Report.

what they felt was the one best way to learn to perform these various tasks. Again, for the largest number of the tasks, it was indicated that either formalized training or the tutoring by an experienced co-worker or supervisor was the best way to learn the tasks. However, in two areas it was indicated by approximately half the respondents that the academic setting was the one best way to learn a task. These areas were the preparation of a report and the advisement and counseling of inmates.

Finally, incumbent officers were asked to indicate whether or not they felt a college level course or courses were essential to the learning of the task. As in the previous responses they indicated that, for most of the tasks, such instruction was not necessary. However, for the same two tasks mentioned above, report preparation and the counseling of inmates, a college-level course was thought to be essential by approximately half of the respondents.

From these admittedly limited and imprecise findings, it is possible to draw some very general conclusions regarding the educational needs of correctional custody personnel. First, it would appear to be very difficult to justify an educational requirement beyond the high school level based upon the purely custody and security related functions performed by custody personnel. In those institutions where such functions make up the principal duties of personnel, there is little evidence to indicate that further education would be necessary or essential. However, in institutions where a rehabilitative function is performed by custody personnel—and by this is meant a direct and active rehabilitative role and not merely a passive sensitization to rehabilitative concerns—a rationale for further educational preparation is suggested. This latter judgment must be strictly limited, however, in that the evidence presented here merely suggests a possible rationale for further education but does not preclude other forms of the preparation, such as formalized training. No evidence is suggested that would indicate that persons employed at a lower educational level could not be trained to perform such tasks or that higher education is a necessary requirement for such tasks.

e. *Conclusions regarding standards.* Although some states and agencies have not yet met this suggested minimum education, most are requiring high school graduation for entrance at the line correctional worker level. Although increased education is recommended by some commissions and professional associations, it is unlikely that graduation from a two-year or four-year college would be a realistic standard unless the line worker's role changes sufficiently to merit it.

2. *The educational attainment of correctional custody personnel.*

a. *Adult corrections officers.* In 1974, the average educational attainment of adult corrections officers was slightly over 12 years, or somewhat better than a high school education.[6] Table V-3 presents the distribution of officers by level of education in 1974. The table indicates that slightly over half the officers attained exactly a high school education, that approximately 28 percent had 13 or more years of education, and that nearly 18 percent had attained

Table V–3

Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Officers, 1974

Year of Education	Corrections Officers		U.S. Populaton*
	Number	Percent	
8 or less	2,700	7.1	29.4
9–11	5,127	11.7	18.6
12	23,776	54.2	27.7
13–15	9,890	22.6	10.7
16 or more	2,346	5.4	13.5
Total	**43,839**	**100.0**	**100.0**

*Computed from U.S. Bureau of Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics 1970, Current Population Survey "Years of Schooling Completed by Males 25 Years Old and Over."

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974.

less than 12 years of education. Thus it would appear that, based on this sample, the proportion of officers failing to meet the minimum educational standard of a high school education is relatively small.

Comparing the educational attainment of adult correctional officers with the educational attainment of the general population of males age 25 and over in 1970, it appears that corrections currently employs persons primarily from the middle educational range of the general population. Whereas persons with eight years of education or less comprised almost 30 percent of the adult male population, in the adult corrections officer position only 7 percent had only that level of education. Similarly, those persons with some high school but less than a full 12 years of education comprised nearly 19 percent of the adult male population, but adult corrections officers with this educational level comprised only 12 percent of the total sample. By contrast, it is apparent that the correctional officer position was filled disproportionately from among those persons with 12 years of education or more; approximately 82 percent of adult corrections officers have attained this educational level. However, the largest proportion of this group has attained only 12 years of education (54 percent) or some college (23 percent). The proportion with 16 or more years of education constitutes only 5 percent of the adult corrections officer force in comparison with over 13 percent found in the general adult male population. In summary, the traditional impression that adult corrections officers are recruited from among the lower educational groups of the general population must be modified. Only at the very high educational levels of the general population can it be said that adult corrections officers are disproportionately underrepresented. In general, correctional officers appear to be slightly better educated than the general adult male population.

Focusing upon the portion of the adult correction officer force with better than a high school education, which constitutes approximately 28 percent of the total force, Table V-4 presents the distribution of officers by level of degree earned. The table indicates that, in terms of actual degrees earned, the largest proportion of officers have earned a bachelor's degree and that a relatively smaller proportion have earned a master's degree or better. The most interesting fact to be noted in Table V-4, however, is the relatively small number of persons indicating the attainment of an associate degree in comparison with the number of persons reporting in Table V-3 the attainment of between 13 and 15 years of education. Two factors may explain this. A large number of officers may have begun to continue their education but not yet have attained the necessary credits for an associate degree. Second, a number of officers may be enrolled in four-year, as opposed to two-year, programs, and thus have not yet received a degree. It would appear that both factors have been operating. Assuming that it requires at least two years to receive an associate degree, approximately 40 percent of the nearly 10,000 officers with between 13 and 15 years of education had completed only 13 years of education as of October 1974. An equal proportion (44 percent of the group) had attained 14 years of education, and the remaining 15 percent had attained 15 years of education. Thus, it would appear that a significant increase in the number of officers with an educational degree can be expected in the immediate future, either at the associate or at the bachelor's degree level. This expectation, of course, is based on the assumption that persons who have begun to improve their education beyond the high school level will complete their programs.

Table V–4

Degrees Earned by Adult Corrections Officers, 1974

Degree Earned	Adult Corrections Officers	
	Number	Percent
Associate	1,155	34.4
Bachelor's	1,825	54.3
Master's	167	5.0
Doctorate	20	0.6
Professional	10	0.3
Other	183	5.4
Total	**3,360**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

b. *Adult corrections supervisors.* In 1974, the average educational attainment of adult corrections supervisors was slightly over 12 years of education. Thus, the educational attainment of adult corrections supervisors, on the average, is virtually the same or slightly higher than that of the line correctional officer.

Table V-5 presents the 1974 distribution of adult corrections custody supervisors by years of education. A relatively small proportion of adult supervisors (slightly less than 13 percent) failed to meet the minimum educational standards of a high school education. The table also indicates that the proportion is somewhat larger than among line personnel. Whereas only 28 percent of line officers had attained this educational level, nearly 38 percent of adult supervisors had gone beyond the minimum standard.

Table V–5

Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Custody Supervisors, 1974

Years of Education	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Total	**2,829**	**100.0**
8 or less	69	2.4
9–11	292	10.3
12	1,393	49.3
13–15	899	31.8
16 or more	176	6.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–6

Degrees Attained by Adult Corrections Custody Supervisors

Degree Earned	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Associate	102	35.2
Bachelor's	147	50.5
Master's	33	11.2
Doctorate	0	0.0
Professional	0	0.0
Other	9	3.1
Total	**290**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census: Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Again comparing line and supervisory employees, the proportion of supervisors with the very lowest educational attainment, eight years or less is significantly smaller than among line personnel. At the next highest level, however, the proportion with some high school is almost identical for both groups.

Examining the distribution of adult corrections supervisors by degree attainment, the pattern of differences between line and supervisory personnel becomes more apparent. Among supervisors who had attained a college degree, Table V-6 indicates that the proportion of supervisors with either an associate or bachelor's degree was approximately the same as among line correctional officers. The primary difference is in the proportion of supervisors having attained a master's degree—more than twice that of the line officers.

c. *Juvenile corrections child care workers.* In the past it has been suggested that, in view of the better working conditions, better salaries, and generally higher status accruing to employees in juvenile corrections, it has been possible to recruit better educated personnel in that area in comparison with the adult corrections system. This judgment appears to be borne out by the evidence.

In 1974, the average educational attainment of the juvenile custody officer was somewhat over 13 years, or one year beyond a high school education. Thus, the average juvenile custody officer can be said to be better educated than the average adult corrections officer by approximately one year of education.

Table V–7 further illustrates the distribution of juvenile custody officers by actual level of education achieved. The table indicates that approximately a third of all juvenile child care workers have attained a high school diploma but have not done college work, approximately half have attained an educational level beyond high school, and only about 15 percent have less than a high school education. Comparing this distribution with that found in adult corrections, it can be seen that the proportion with less than a high school education is approximately the same for both areas. However, at other levels, it is apparent that juvenile corrections employs a smaller proportion with a high school education and a considerably larger proportion of persons with better than a high school education than is the case in adult corrections. Thus, as in adult corrections, the proportion of juvenile custody officers failing to meet the minimum standard of a high school education is comparatively small. Moreover, it would appear that the proportion exceeding the minimum standard of 12 years of education constitutes somewhat over half of the force.

The proportion of juvenile custody officers with better than a high school education is further described in Table V-8. The table indicates that the distribution of actual degrees earned within this group is significantly different from that in adult corrections. While the largest proportion of persons

Table V–7

Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, 1974

Years of Education	Child Care Workers	
	Number	Percent
8 or less	447	3.7
9–11	1,317	11.0
12	3,953	33.1
13–15	3,366	28.2
16 or more	2,846	23.9
Total	**11,929**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–8

Degrees Earned by Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, 1974

Degrees Earned	Child Care Workers	
	Number	Percent
Associate	426	12.7
Bachelor's	2,307	69.1
Master's	371	11.1
Doctorate	0	0.0
Professional	20	0.6
Other	217	6.5
Total	**3,341**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–9

Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Supervisors, 1974

Years of Education	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Total	**846**	**100.0**
8 or less	6	0.7
9–11	102	12.1
12	193	22.8
13–15	210	24.8
16 or more	334	39.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

with an earned degree is those with a bachelor's degree in both instances, a significantly larger proportion have earned degrees beyond the bachelor's than in adult corrections.

d. *Juvenile corrections custody supervisors.* In 1974, the estimated average educational attainment of the supervisors of juvenile custody officers was 14 years of education, or 2 years beyond the high school diploma. Thus, unlike the pattern found in adult corrections, the educational attainment of supervisors in juvenile corrections is significantly better than that of line officers.

Table V-9 presents the distribution of juvenile custody supervisors by years of educational attainment. The table indicates that well over 60 percent of juvenile supervisors have an educational attainment beyond high school. The largest single educational category is that of 16 or more years of education, thus breaking the pattern noted among line and supervisory personnel in adult corrections, and line custody personnel in juvenile corrections.

Table V–10

Degrees Attained by Juvenile Corrections Custody Supervisors, 1974

Degree Attained	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Total	**291**	**100.0**
Associate	24	8.3
Bachelor's	214	73.7
Master's	25	8.6
Doctorate	0	0.0
Professional	21	7.0
Other	7	2.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Overall, better than 80 percent of juvenile supervisors meet or exceed a minimum standard of a high school education. However, it should be noted that, despite the generally higher educational attainment of juvenile supervisors in comparison with the other occupations so far examined, the proportion of supervisors with less than a high school education is the same as that found among adult supervisors (approximately 13 percent).

Table V-10 presents the distribution of juvenile supervisors who had college degrees by level of degree attainment. The table indicates a unique pattern of degree attainment among juvenile custody supervisors. As in the other occupations, the most frequently held degree is the bachelor's, constituting almost three-fourths of all degrees held. There is a correspondingly smaller proportion of master's degrees held in comparison with line personnel. However, this is offset by a substantially larger proportion of supervisors holding a professional degree, a proportion far larger than that found among the other correctional occupations so far examined.

3. *Patterns in educational attainment of custodial personnel by age.* Table V-11 presents the years of education of adult corrections line and supervisory custodial personnel by age of the respondents. The average age of adult corrections line and supervisory personnel is estimated to be about 39 years. The average educational attainment of this group is approximately 12 years. Variations from the mean, however, establish a distinctive and expected pattern. In general the younger incumbent officers or supervisors tend to be better educated than their older counterparts, although at the extreme age categories there appears to be a slight variation from this pattern. After age 20, the proportion of officers and supervisors with less than a high school educa-

Table V–11

Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Line Officers and Supervisors, by Age: 1974

Age	Years of Education											
	8 or Less		9–11		12		13–15		16 or more		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 20	0	0.0	31	20.5	104	68.9	16	10.6	0	0.0	151	100.0
20–24	4	0.1	216	4.5	2387	49.3	1430	29.6	800	16.5	4837	100.0
25–34	96	0.6	645	4.0	7855	50.4	4788	30.7	2200	14.1	15584	100.0
35–44	430	3.6	1070	8.9	6681	55.9	2821	23.6	958	8.0	11960	100.0
45–54	861	7.4	2143	18.5	5949	51.2	2001	17.2	654	5.6	11608	100.0
55–64	1065	19.1	1207	21.7	2556	45.9	454	8.2	284	5.1	5566	100.0
65 or more	259	53.1	115	23.6	66	13.5	5	1.0	43	8.8	488	100.0
Total	**2715**	**5.4**	**5427**	**10.8**	**25598**	**51.0**	**11515**	**22.9**	**4939**	**9.8**	**50194**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

tion steadily increases as the age of the respondents increases. Conversely, the proportion of officers and supervisors with an educational attainment of better than high school steadily decreases as the age of the respondent increases. However, for those with exactly a high school education, with 12 years of education attained, the proportion in each age category remains fairly constant, except again within the very youngest and the very oldest age categories. Among those whose age is less than 20 years, the proportion with 12 years of education is significantly higher than among the other age categories. Among those age 65 and over the proportion with 12 years of education is significantly lower than among the other age categories.

The interpretation that can be made of this data is fairly straightforward. It appears that on the basis of age there has been a steady improvement in the educational attainment of persons recruited into corrections. Moreover, as the older incumbents begin to drop out of the active force, it is reasonable to expect a considerable overall improvement in the general educational level of incumbents in these positions. The magnitude of this upgrading can be estimated by considering that within the next 10 years, presuming that retirement age is 65, almost 50 percent of those incumbent officers with 8 years of education or less and nearly a quarter of those with between 9 and 11 years of education will have left the active force. By contrast, within that same time period less than 5 percent of those with an educational attainment beyond high school will have left correctional employment. Presuming that there is no extraordinary decline in the educational achievement of new officers hired in this period and no significant turnover among the younger, better educated portion of the present force, it is reasonable to expect a considerable increase in the average educational attainment in the line and supervisory custodial positions in adult corrections.

Within juvenile corrections, the pattern of educational attainment by age among line child care workers and their supervisors is similar to that found in adult corrections (Table V-12). However, given the overall higher educational attainment noted previously, juvenile corrections line workers and supervisors are generally younger than their counterparts in adult corrections. The average age of this group is estimated to be about 37 years, or 2 years younger than the average adult officer or supervisor. The average educational attainment of this group is slightly less than 14 years of education, in comparison with the average of somewhat more than 12 years of education in adult corrections.

The pattern of educational attainment in juvenile corrections is similar to that found in adult corrections. The proportion of line workers and supervisors with less than 12 years of education increases steadily as the age of the respondent increases. By contrast, the proportion of officers and supervisors with education beyond the high school level steadily decreases as the age of the respondent increases. The primary difference between adult and juvenile corrections custody personnel is with respect to the proportion with exactly 12 years of education. With the exception of those in the very youngest and very oldest age categories, the proportion of juvenile personnel with this educational attainment increases as the age of the respondents increase. This is in contrast to adult corrections, where the proportion

Table V–12

Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers and Supervisors, by Age: 1974

Age	Years of Education											
	8 or Less		9–11		12		13–15		16 or more		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 20	0	0.0	0	0.0	54	52.9	48	47.1	0	0.0	102	100.0
20–24	9	0.3	7	0.2	406	14.9	897	32.8	1413	51.7	2732	100.0
25–34	23	0.3	332	4.5	1406	19.2	2146	29.2	3431	46.7	7338	100.0
35–44	94	3.0	330	11.2	1019	34.5	714	24.2	793	26.9	2950	100.0
45–54	69	2.3	318	10.8	1134	38.3	854	28.9	582	19.7	2957	100.0
55–64	258	11.9	585	27.0	872	40.2	289	13.3	165	7.6	2169	100.0
65 or more	8	11.6	26	37.7	26	37.7	6	8.7	3	4.3	69	100.0
Total ..	**461**	**2.5**	**1,598**	**8.7**	**4,917**	**26.8**	**4,954**	**27.0**	**6387**	**34.9**	**18,317**	**100.0**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

with a high school education remained relatively constant across all but the extreme age categories. Thus, it would appear that the educational base of personnel in juvenile corrections is not only higher than in adult corrections but is shifting much more rapidly toward higher educational levels.

Interpretation of the data presented in Table V-12 suggests that there has been, and will continue to be, significant improvement in the overall educational attainment of juvenile custody personnel. The magnitude of this improvement is also interpreted to be somewhat greater than in adult corrections, where there appears to be a larger and more stable proportion of custody personnel at or around the 12 year educational level. Increases in educational attainment due to the retirement of older personnel are also likely to be more significant than in adult corrections. Within 10 years, again presuming retirement at age 65, it is estimated that almost 60 percent of those personnel with 8 years of education or less, and almost 40 percent of those with between 9 and 11 years of education will have left the active force. Within that same period, only slightly more than 4 percent of those with a better than high school education will have left the force. Thus, again barring radical changes in entry and turnover patterns, it is reasonable to assume a significant overall improvement in the educational attainment of juvenile corrections custody personnel.

4. *Educational attainment of custody personnel by date of entry.* The changes noted in the educational attainment of adult and juvenile custody personnel can be attributed to two principal factors: the pattern of educational attainment found among newly employed personnel, and the pattern of educational upgrading among incumbent personnel. Both of these patterns appear to be operating to raise the overall educational level of these occupations in very decisive ways.

Tables V-13 and V-14 present the pattern of attainment among adult and juvenile custody officers at the time they first entered their agency of employment and the current pattern of attainment. In order to develop a sense of historical movement the current incumbent population is broken down by the period of time when these officers were first employed.

Table V-13, presenting the pattern of attainment for adult corrections officers, clearly indicates a dual trend toward higher educational attainment—both a rising level of education among officers at entry, and a concerted movement toward higher levels among incumbent staff. Presuming that incumbent officers remaining in the present custody force are representative of the group of officers entering at a given period, the first column of Table V-13 indicates an increasing proportion of officers with an educational attainment above the high school level, and a decreasing proportion of officers with less than a high school level education as the period of entry becomes more recent. Prior to 1964 approximately 32 percent of the officers employed had less than 12 years of education. However, among those officers employed between 1965 and 1969 the proportion had decreased to less than 24 percent, and among those hired between 1970 and 1974 it had decreased again to less than 15 percent. The opposite pattern can be noted with respect to the proportion of officers with better than 12 years of education. Among those hired prior to 1960 the proportion with 12 or more years of education was only slightly over 9 percent. Among subsequently employed cohorts, however, the pro-

Table V–13

Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers at Time of Entry into Current Agency, and Currently, by Period of Entry

Period of Entry	Years of Education	Attainment at Time of Entry	Current Attainment
1970–74	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	4.7	4.1
	9–11 years	10.1	8.2
	12 years	56.9	53.2
	13–15 years	21.7	27.0
	16 years or more	6.6	7.5
	Number of officers	24,104	23,488
1965–69	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	6.5	5.8
	9–11 years	17.1	15.0
	12 years	61.4	54.5
	13–15 years	12.8	21.1
	16 years or more	2.2	3.5
	Number of officers	9,289	8,438
1960–64	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	10.7	9.6
	9–11 years	23.6	17.9
	12 years	52.1	52.6
	13–15 years	12.7	17.7
	1 years or more	0.8	2.1
	Number of officers	5,921	5,149
Prior to 1960	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	12.9	11.2
	9–11 years	18.9	15.0
	12 years	59.0	57.2
	13–15 years	7.7	14.6
	16 years or more	1.5	1.9
	Number of officers	7,517	6,522

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–14

Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers at Time of Entry into Current Agency, and Currently, by Period of Entry

Period of Entry	Years of Education	Attainment at Time of Entry	Current Attainment
1970–74	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years of less	2.3	1.8
	9–11 years	10.1	8.6
	12 years	33.3	30.8
	13–15 years	27.7	29.9
	16 years or more	26.5	28.9
	Number of officers	7,601	7,390
1965–69	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	9.8	8.9
	9–11 years	14.3	11.3
	12 years	36.4	32.3
	13–15 years	25.8	25.6
	16 years or more	13.7	21.9
	Number of officers	3,046	2,704
1960–64	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	7.6	3.0
	9–11 years	28.0	21.1
	12 years	36.9	47.2
	13–15 years	26.3	24.7
	16 years or more	7.1	4.0
	Number of officers	1,444	1,111
Prior to 1960	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	8 years or less	10.4	7.1
	9–11 years	22.9	23.4
	12 years	59.1	48.0
	13–15 years	5.3	11.9
	16 years or more	2.2	9.5
	Number of officers	545	504

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

portion increased steadily so that among those employed between 1970 and 1974 over 28 percent had 13 or more years of education.

At the same time that the educational attainment of new officers had improved, Table V-13 indicates that there has been an upgrading of education among incumbent personnel. Allowing for differing response rates, and comparing the first and second columns of the table, it can be seen that there has been an upward shift in educational attainment between the date of entry and 1974. For example, among those officers employed between 1965 and 1969, the proportion with less than a high school education has decreased from 23.6 percent at the time of entry to 20.8 percent in 1974. The proportion with 12 years of education has similarly decreased from 61.4 percent at time of entry to 54.5 percent in 1974. Finally, the proportion with 13 or more years of education has increased from 15.0 percent at time of entry to 24.6 percent in 1974. Similar patterns may be noted among each of the groups presented in Table V-13.

Table V-14, presenting the pattern of attainment at entry and currently for juvenile corrections officers, indicates that the rate of improvement in juvenile corrections has been more pronounced than in adult corrections. With respect to the pattern of attainment of newly employed child care workers, the table suggests a major shift away from the high school education level toward the attainment of a bachelor's or intermediate level degrees. In the group of child care workers employed prior to 1960 the proportion with better than 12 years of education was only 7.5 percent. However, among officers employed subsequent to 1960, the proportion with 13 or more years of education increased dramatically, so that among those employed between 1970 and 1974, over half have some education beyond 12 years and over a quarter have attained 16 or more years of education. Similarly, as the proportion of newly-employed officers with better than a high school education has increased, the proportion with 12 years of education or less has steadily diminished. Prior to 1960 this group constituted 92 percent of new hires, containing, moreover, 33 percent with less than 12 years of education. Among child care workers employed between 1970 and 1974, however, the proportion had decreased to 45.7 percent, and only 12.4 percent had less than 12 years of education. Based upon these figures it can be suggested that new juvenile corrections child care workers are increasingly oriented toward degrees in higher education, and that improvement in entry-level educational attainment is much more rapid than in adult corrections.

The rate of in-service upgrading in juvenile corrections appears to be comparable to that found in adult corrections. On the basis of Table V-14 it appears that the higher educational levels at entry in juvenile corrections have not served to dampen the tendency toward further improvement on an inservice basis.

In summary, the data presented in Tables V-13 and V-14 indicate that there has been a decisive improvement in the educational attainment of adult and juvenile custody personnel, resulting from an improvement in the level of education at entry and from a concerted movement toward higher educational levels among incumbent employees. Of the two areas of corrections, juvenile corrections appears to be making the most rapid improvement, primarily on the basis of higher attainment among newly employed personnel. Both adult and juvenile corrections custody personnel have improved their education since entry, and the rate of that improvement appears to be approximately the same in both areas.[7]

5. *The educational attainment of correctional custody personnel by geographic region.* In order to better assess the extent and level of deficiency in educational attainment in corrections, it is useful to consider the geographic location of personnel as well as their individual characteristics. Historically, the educational attainment of the general population has varied significantly among certain areas of regions of the country. These variations have often been associated with the level of urbanization present within individual regions, those with higher levels of urbanization having a generally higher average level of education than areas with lower urbanization. Thus, states and regions with a predominantly rural character, such as the South and the smaller northern and western states, have generally lagged behind the predominantly urbanized areas of the Northeast, the Midwest, and the Pacific states. Although it is invalid to generalize about entire regions on the basis of overall averages, given the recognized fact that within regions there are often broad variations, it is nonetheless instructive to indicate those areas of the country where educational attainment is generally lower than average or where attainment is below recognized standards.

Table V-15 presents the distribution of adult correctional officers with respect to educational attainment, breaking down this population by region. The regional grouping is based upon the standardized grouping of states developed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, presented in the footnote to Table V-15.

Table V-15 suggests that, with the exception of the Pacific region, there is relatively little variation in the median level of education currently maintained by adult corrections officers among the various regions. In each of the regions, the median educational attainment is somewhat greater than 12 years of education. The sole exception, the Pacific region, had a significantly higher median educational level, approaching 14 years of education in 1974.

By examining the proportion of officers at each level of education in the various regions, however, it is possible to distinguish certain areas where educational attainment differs. Considering first the proportion below the generally recognized standard of a high school education, it is apparent that two regions, the East South Central and West South Central, have the highest proportions failing to meet the standard. In the East South Central region, over 34 percent of all incumbent officers fail to meet the 12-year standard, and in the West South Central region, this proportion is 29 percent. Of the two regions, however, the East South Central region lags behind with almost 19 percent of all officers with 8 years or less of education in 1974. After these two regions, the areas having the highest proportion of officers below the high school standard are the South Atlantic and East North Central regions. Nearly a quarter of the officers employed in these two regions failed to meet the 12-year standard. The South Atlantic region had 10.9 percent with 8 years of education or less compared with 7.4 percent in the latter region.

Thus, with respect to the general standard, it may be suggested that the entire area of what is called the Old South appears to contain the highest concentration of officers below the standard. These patterns appear to follow the general educational patterns of

Table V–15

Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers by Census Region, 1974

(Percent of officers)

Census Region*	Years of Education						
	Total	8 Years or Less	9–11 Years	12 Years	13–15 Years	16 Years or More	Median Years of Education
U.S. Total	**100.0**	**5.9**	**11.6**	**53.9**	**23.1**	**5.4**	**12.60**
New England	100.0	3.0	12.8	60.0	18.8	5.4	12.57
Middle Atlantic	100.0	0.8	8.4	66.3	21.3	3.1	12.61
East North Central	100.0	7.4	16.2	52.4	18.6	5.4	12.50
West North Central	100.0	1.2	13.2	49.8	22.6	6.3	12.57
South Atlantic	100.0	10.9	13.7	50.8	19.8	4.9	12.50
East South Central	100.0	18.7	15.6	44.4	16.7	4.6	12.35
West South Central	100.0	7.7	21.3	49.0	14.4	7.3	12.42
Mountain	100.0	4.5	8.3	46.5	32.7	7.8	12.80
Pacific	100.0	0.3	2.6	34.8	50.5	11.8	13.73

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

*The following states make up the various Census regions: *New England*—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut; *Middle Atlantic*—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania; *East North Central*—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; *West North Central*—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas; *South Atlantic*—Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida; *East South Central*—Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi; *West South Central*—Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas; *Mountain*—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada; *Pacific*—Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii.

the national population. That is, the areas with the highest proportion of officers below the standard are also the areas with a lower educational base in the general population. In 1970, the median educational level of persons in the East South Central region was 10.2 years for males over age 25 and 10.6 years for females over age 25, as compared with the national median of 12.1 years of education for both males and females over age 25. In the West South Central region, the median education level was 11.5 years for both males and females over 25 in 1970, and the medians for the South Atlantic region were 11.3 and 11.6 years of education for males and females over 25 respectively. All other regions of the country varied narrowly between 12.1 and 12.4 years of education in 1970. Thus, it appears that with the exception of the East North Central region, the proportion of officers below the standard of a high school education parallels the educational level of the general population in the various regions.

Table V-16 presents the educational distribution of juvenile corrections child care workers by region. The table suggests a significantly different pattern of attainment than that found among adult corrections officers. First, there are differences between regions with respect to median years of education among child care workers. The Pacific region, with a median attainment of over 16 years of education, far exceeds the rest of the nation. Outside this area, however, there are three regions with a median educational attainment of over 13 years: the Mountain region, the West North Central region, and the West South Central region. The remaining regions, all lying east of the Mississippi River, vary in median attainment between 12.88 years of education and 12.71 years of education.

Examining the individual educational categories by region, other differences appear. The region with the largest proportion of personnel with less than 12 years of education is the Middle Atlantic region, with nearly 27 percent at that level. The next highest region is the West South Central region with almost 23 percent of child care workers below 12 years of attainment, followed by the New England region and the East South Central region with approximately 19 percent of child care workers with less than 12 years of education. Thus, with the exception of the West South Central region, the principal distinction between regions with respect to the educational attainment of child care workers is an east-west distinction, with western regions employing persons with generally higher educational attainment.

C. Assessment of the Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Officers: Standards and Levels

1. *Educational standards.* Probation and parole, among all the various areas in corrections, has had

Table V–16

Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, by Census Region

(Percentage of officers)

Census Region*	Years of Education						
	Total	8 Years or Less	9–11 Years	12 Years	13–15 Years	16 Years or More	Median Years of Education
U.S. Total	**100.0**	**3.6**	**11.1**	**32.5**	**28.0**	**24.9**	**13.39**
New England	100.0	6.5	12.3	43.5	22.6	14.6	12.71
Middle Atlantic	100.0	8.8	17.8	30.2	30.5	12.6	12.77
East North Central	100.0	1.7	13.9	39.9	26.6	17.9	12.86
West North Central	100.0	2.3	3.8	38.1	30.3	25.1	13.54
South Atlantic	100.0	4.6	9.6	40.4	30.0	15.2	12.88
East South Central	1[illegible].0	8.2	10.5	37.3	26.1	17.9	12.84
West South Central	100.0	4.2	18.6	25.3	29.4	21.8	13.16
Mountain	100.0	2.8	4.6	35.7	35.3	21.6	13.59
Pacific	100.0	0.0	5.6	12.3	23.3	58.7	16.26

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employees Characteristics Survey, 1975.

* For a description of the states contained within each region see Table V–15.

perhaps the most concise set of standards with respect to educational attainment. Since 1931, the prevailing opinion of persons concerned with this matter has been that probation and parole officers require an extensive grounding in casework and welfare. This perception led naturally to the establishment of the social work degree as the preferred educational preparation for these positions. However, in recent years concern over the inability of probation and parole agencies to recruit sufficient numbers of persons with this educational background, as well as questions by authorities as to whether this degree is really a necessary prerequisite to goal performance led to a broadening of the standard to include other educational credentials.

The various standards suggested by professional and public interest associations have in recent years converged upon two standards: "minimum" and "preferred." The preferred standard is the completion of two years of graduate study in an accredited school of social work or comparable study in criminology, sociology, or a related field. The minimum standard consists of graduation from an accredited college or university with a major in the social or behavioral sciences *and* either one year of graduate study in social work or a related field, such as counseling or guidance, *or* one full year of full time paid social work experience under professional supervision and direction in a recognized welfare agency. This dual standard has been endorsed, with minor variations, by the American Bar Association, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the American Correctional Association.[9]

Each of the major national studies since 1967 has also suggested educational standards for the probation and parole officer. Advisors to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended essentially the dual standard as outlined above.[10] However, in 1968, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training revised the standard on the basis of its appraisal of manpower needs in probation and parole in relation to the available pool of persons meeting the previously suggested standard. The standard proposed by the Joint Commission was a bachelor's degree, preferably in the area of study in the social or behavioral sciences. This reduction, however, was premised upon the development of adequate inservice training programs to assure that persons in these positions would be adequately prepared to carry out their duties.[11] The same standard was recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in 1973.[12]

Despite the pronouncements of the national associations and the national commissions, the most critical standards with respect to the educational preparation of probation and parole officers are those established by individual state and local probation and parole agencies. Table V-17 presents the most recent available requirements for probation and parole positions as established by several states. As the table indicates, the largest number of states have established the bachelor's degree as the minimum educational requirement for entry-level probation and parole officers. Only three states have established a minimum standard at the high school level, and

Table V–17

State Educational Standards for Probation and Parole Officers, 1974–75

	Educational Level	Comments
Alabama	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Alaska	Bachelor's	Probation officer
Arizona	—	No information
Arkansas	Bachelor's	Parole officer
California	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Colorado	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Connecticut	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Delaware	Bachelor's	Counselor
District of Columbia	Bachelor's	
Florida	High school	Classification specialist
Georgia	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Hawaii	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Idaho	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Illinois	Bachelor's	Parole counselor
Indiana	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Iowa	High school	Probation and parole officer
Kansas	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Kentucky	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Louisiana	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Maine	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Maryland	Bachelor's	
Massachusetts	No requirement	Parole officer
Michigan	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Minnesota	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Mississippi	High school	Parole officer
Missouri	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Montana	Bachelor's	Aftercare counselor
Nebraska	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Nevada	Bachelor's	
New Hampshire	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
New Jersey	Bachelor's	Parole officer
New Mexico	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
New York	Bachelor's	Youth counselor
North Carolina	Bachelor's	Parole officer
North Dakota	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Ohio	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Oklahoma	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Oregon	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Pennsylvania	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Rhode Island	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
South Carolina	Bachelor's	Probation officer
South Dakota	Bachelor's	Probation officer
Tennessee	Bachelor's	
Texas	Bachelor's	Parole officer
Utah	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Vermont	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Virginia	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Washington	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
West Virginia	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Wisconsin	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer
Wyoming	Bachelor's	Probation and parole officer

Source: Hecker, Field, and Powell, "Survey of Probation and Parole Supervisors and Counselors," *American Journal of Corrections* (March-April 1976) pp. 31, 32, 42–44.

information is not available for the four additional states.

State standards, however, cover only those agencies directly under state regulation. Standards for agencies not under state jurisdiction are thus set by individual agencies. For example, in the area of juvenile probation, educational requirements may be set either by local agencies or by presiding judges of the supervising juvenile court. However, the authority of local jurisdictions to set requirements may be limited by established state regulations issued by civil service commissions.[13]

Table V-18 presents the distribution of the minimum entry-level educational requirements of probation and parole agencies, based upon the responses of 1,973 probation and parole agencies. The table indicates that there is a considerably larger degree of variation among individual agencies in terms of educational qualifications than is indicated by examining only state requirements. Although most of the agencies require a bachelor's degree, there is an almost even distribution between agencies requiring a bachelor's degree in the social sciences and those accepting any bachelor's degree. A sizable portion of the agencies (15 percent) require an educational level below a bachelor's degree, and over half of these require only a high school diploma. More surprisingly, only 4 percent of the agencies require educational attainment beyond the bachelor's level, and of these, only a small proportion require the masters of social work degree.

For purposes of this analysis, it would appear that the most widely accepted standard of educational attainment for probation and parole officers is the bachelor's degree. Although certain professional groups have endorsed a higher educational standard,

Table V–18

Minimum Educational Requirements of Probation and Parole Agencies, 1974

Education Level Required	Number	Percent
High school	155	7.8
1 year of college	13	0.7
2–3 years of college	129	6.5
Bachelor's in social science	820	41.6
Bachelor's in any field	778	39.4
Master's in social work	8	0.4
Master's in any field	8	0.4
Other	62	3.2
Total	**1,973**	**100.0**

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1976.

Table V–19

Number of Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers, 1974

Years of Education	Officers	
	Number	Percent
Total	**21,840**	**100.0**
8 or less	13	0.1
9–11	107	0.4
12	867	4.0
13–15	1,306	6.0
16	11,691	53.5
17 or more	7,858	36.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics, 1975.

Table V–20

Degrees Attained by Probation and Parole Officers, 1974

Degree Attained	Officers	
	Number	Percent
Total	**19,601**	**100.0**
Associate	455	2.3
Bachelor's	15,114	77.1
Master's	3,445	17.6
Doctorate	40	0.2
Professional	288	1.5
Other	260	1.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

the standard actually in use by operating agencies appear to be the bachelor's degree. It is against this standard that the evaluation of the educational attainment of current probation and parole officers is undertaken in this chapter.

2. *Educational levels of attainment*. Within corrections, the area which has traditionally employed the most educated body of personnel has been probation and parole. Moreover, the relative stability of the standards employed in these agencies as well as their long standing recognition, would tend to suggest that educational levels would be more uniform than those found in adult and juvenile institutions. This judgment appears to be supported by the data presented here.

a. *Probation and parole officers*. In 1974, the average educational attainment of probation and parole officers was slightly over 16 years, or slightly beyond a bachelor's level education (see Table V-19). The table clearly indicates that only slightly less than 90 percent of probation and parole officers meet or exceed the minimum standard of a bachelor's degree. Moreover, better than a third of all officers have attained an educational level beyond the required bachelor's degree. Less than 1 percent of all officers have less than a high school education, and the majority (6 percent) have attained between 13 to 15 years of education, indicating some college preparation. Only 4 percent of all officers have achieved only a high school education.

The pattern of degree attainment among probation and parole officers is presented in Table V-20. The table indicates that over three-quarters of those officers who have earned a degree in higher education hold a bachelor's degree. A relatively small proportion have earned an associate degree, or a doctoral or professional level degree. Most apparent also is the lack of adherence to the previously suggested standard of a master's degree, less than 20 percent of all officers having earned that credential in 1974. This suggests that despite its long standing recognition as the preferred level of education, a relatively small proportion of officers in probation and parole have been recruited on the basis of a graduate level education.

b. *Probation and parole supervisors*. In 1974, the estimated average educational attainment of probation and parole supervisors was slightly less than 17 years, or one year of study beyond the bachelor's degree. Thus, the educational attainment of probation and parole supervisors is somewhat better on the average than that of the line probation and parole officer.

Table V-21 presents the distribution of educational attainment among probation and parole supervisors. This table indicates that with relatively few exceptions probation and parole supervisors meet a mini-

Table V–21

Number of Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Supervisors, 1974

Years of Education	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Total	**2,830**	**100.0**
8 or less	0	0.0
9–11	10	0.4
12	48	1.7
13–15	112	4.0
16	1,039	36.7
17 or more	1,620	57.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–22

Degrees Attained by Probation and Parole Supervisors, 1974

Degree Attained	Supervisors	
	Number	Percent
Total	**2,640**	**100.0**
Associate	4	0.2
Bachelor's	1,902	72.1
Master's	571	21.6
Doctorate	18	0.7
Professional	144	5.4
Other	0	0.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

mum standard of a bachelor's degree, and in the majority of cases exceed this standard. The proportion of officers not meeting the standard is slightly over 6 percent and of these nearly three-fourths have attained at least some schooling beyond high school.

Table V-22 presents the pattern of degree attainment among probation and parole supervisors. This table is particularly interesting in that it clarifies the distribution of supervisory personnel having an educational level beyond the bachelor's degree. From this table it appears that although the majority of supervisors have had additional schooling beyond the bachelor's degree this has not necessarily been translated into actual degree attainment. The number of supervisors reporting an educational attainment beyond 16 years of education is approximately twice the number of persons reporting the attainment of a degree beyond the bachelor's level. Accounting for a differential level of reporting in the survey and the possible incomparability of educational data when translating years of education into degree attainment, it still appears likely that a sizable proportion of probation supervisors are, in effect, "between degrees." That is, they have begun work toward a higher degree but have not yet attained it. A similar pattern appears likely with respect to those supervisors reporting an educational attainment of between 13 and 15 years. Here again it appears that many of these persons have begun to pursue, but have not yet achieved, the minimum required bachelor's degree.

3. *Patterns in the educational attainment of probation and parole personnel by age.* Table V-23 presents the distribution of probation and parole officers and supervisors by the age of the respondents. The average age of probation and parole officers and supervisors is 35.8 years. This is slightly less than the average age of line and supervisory personnel in adult corrections (39 years) and juvenile corrections. Because of the higher educational attainment in probation and parole, the interaction of age and education becomes a matter of both generational differences and the differences between age categories in the opportunity to attain higher educational levels. That is, consideration must be given to both the tendency for younger personnel to be better educated than older personnel, and the factor that younger personnel have had less time to attain advanced degrees than older personnel. A third factor to be considered is the suggestion made by a number of previous studies that, because of the difficulty probation and parole agencies have had recruiting persons with better than a college degree, there has been a relative decline in the overall educational attainment of persons recruited into these agencies. Suggestions to this effect have been made by the previously cited Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.

Table V–23

Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Workers and Supervisors, by Age, 1975

Age	Years of Education							Number Responding
	Total	8 or less	9–11	12	13–15	16	17 or more	
All respondents	100.0	0.1	0.5	3.6	5.7	51.7	38.4	24,571
Less than 20	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	7
20–24	100.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.5	74.0	14.2	2,364
25–34	100.0	0.0	*	0.5	2.5	58.1	38.9	11,714
35–44	100.0	0.0	0.5	2.2	7.1	41.8	48.3	5,346
45–54	100.0	0.3	0.9	7.8	8.9	39.7	42.3	3,657
55–64	100.0	0.0	3.5	21.8	13.5	32.2	28.8	1,266
65 or more	100.0	0.0	2.3	35.0	13.8	15.2	33.6	217

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

The pattern presented in Table V-23 neither confirms nor denies the suggestion of declining educational attainment. However, it does suggest considerably greater stability in the educational attainment of probation and parole personnel than in either adult or juvenile corrections. Table V-23 suggests that probation and parole officers between 20 and 54 years of age have relatively similar educational backgrounds. In each age category, over 80 percent of the officers have 16 years of education or more, and of those with less than 16 years of education, the largest proportion have attained some education beyond high school. The age category 20 to 24 years consists primarily of persons with 16 years of education, but only a comparatively small proportion have attained education beyond the college degree level. The next three age cohorts, 25 to 34 years, 35 to 44 years, and 45 to 54 years, each show an increased shift toward educational levels beyond 16 years. This pattern may suggest a decline in educational attainment at entry, but it may also suggest a significant level of in-service upgrading on the part of older personnel. The relatively small proportion of persons aged 20 to 24 with better than 16 years of education also may suggest either a declining level of education at entry or merely the relative lack of time such persons have had to advance beyond the 16-year level.

The age cohorts 55 to 64 years and 65 years and older differ from the younger age categories in that they have proportionately greater numbers of persons with less than 16 years of education. Although this group constitutes only 6 percent of the probation and parole sample it contains 25 percent of officers and supervisors with less than 16 years of education and 40 percent of those with less than 13 years of education. However, despite the disproportionately larger numbers of persons with lower educational attainment in these categories, the difference between them and the younger cohorts is significantly less than the difference between the older and younger cohorts in adult and juvenile corrections. This may suggest a greater level of stability in educational attainment in probation and parole than in either adult or juvenile corrections. Thus it may be suggested that the future level of education in this area, given the relatively small number of persons with an attainment of less than 16 years of education, and the apparent stability in overall levels of attainment between cohorts, is not likely to improve significantly within the next 10 years.

Table V–24

The Educational Attainment of Incumbent Probation and Parole Officers at Time of Entry into Current Agency of Employment, and Currently, by Period of Entry

(Percentage of officers)

Period of Entry	Years of Education	Attainment at Time of Entry	Current Attainment
1970–74	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	Less than 12 years	1.6	0.5
	12 years	5.8	3.2
	13–15 years	9.5	5.1
	16 years	61.2	57.0
	17 years or more	21.9	34.2
	Number of officers	16,248	13,696
1965–69	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	Less than 12 years	3.0	0.3
	12 years	6.7	3.1
	13–15 years	10.8	7.7
	16 years	59.9	47.9
	17 years or more	19.6	41.0
	Number of officers	7,161	5,175
1960–64	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	Less than 12 years	1.5	1.4
	12 years	12.2	7.5
	13–15 years	19.3	9.6
	16 years	46.9	52.9
	17 years or more	20.1	28.6
	Number of officers	2,456	1,427
Prior to 1960	Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
	Less than 12 years	0.5	0.8
	12 years	8.8	12.3
	13–15 years	8.6	2.5
	16 years	47.2	42.0
	17 years or more	34.9	42.4
	Number of officers	2,837	1,325

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

4. *The educational attainment of probation and parole personnel by period of entry.* The pattern of educational attainment presented has suggested that there has been relatively little change over the past ten to fifteen years. However, a somewhat different profile of educational attainment in this area emerges when the incumbent population is divided into cohorts based upon the period of their entry in probation and parole. By examining each cohort with respect to its pattern of attainment at time of entry and its current pattern of attainment it is possible to trace changes between cohorts and within cohorts over time.

Table V–24 presents the educational attainment of incumbent probation and parole officers at the time they entered their current agency of employment, and their current level of attainment, controlling for the period they entered probation and parole. The table indicates that, as in adult and juvenile corrections, a dual pattern of change emerges: a shift in attainment at entry and in-service educational upgrading between time of entry and 1974.

Considering first the change in educational attainment at entry it appears that there has been a relatively distinct change in the educational distribution of personnel since 1960, and a sharp change in educational distribution of persons hired before and after 1960. Assuming that incumbent personnel are typical of the personnel employed at a given period of time, it appears that those persons hired prior to 1960 were somewhat better educated at the time they were first employed than persons hired subsequent to 1960. This is suggested by the smaller proportion of officers with less than 12 years of education, and the larger proportion with 17 years of education or more among the pre-1960 cohort. Over a third of the officers employed before 1960 report an educational attainment of 17 or more years at the time they were first employed, and less than 1 percent of this group reported an entry-level attainment of less than 12 years. By contrast, the proportion of officers with 17 or more years of education at entry in each of the subsequent cohorts has remained near 20 percent, and the proportion with less than 12 years of education ranges between 1.5 and 3 percent. Similarly, the proportion of officers in the pre-1960 cohort first employed with less than 16 years of education is smaller than the proportion found in each of the subsequent cohorts.

Changes in entry-level attainment are also evident when the cohorts employed after 1960 are considered in isolation. It appears that there has been a steady improvement in entry-level attainment since 1960, characterized by an increase in the proportion of new hires with 16 years of education and a decline in the proportion with less than 16 years of education. In summary, it is suggested that at some point in the past there was a decline in the entry-level attainment of probation and parole personnel, but that subsequent to that decline there has been a gradual pattern of improvement. The nature of this change, moreover, has been away from the initial employment of persons with a graduate education, and toward the employment of persons at the bachelor's level. A partial explanation for this pattern may be the accelerated rate of employment noted in the manpower section of this volume. This increase may have resulted in an initial lowering of entry-level educational standards in order to recruit sufficient numbers of employees.

The second pattern noted in Table V–24 related to evidence of educational upgrading in-service between the date of entry and 1974. Allowing for differential rates of reporting education at entry and current education, the table suggests that a significant proportion of probation and parole officers had improved their educational status between the time they entered probation and parole and 1974. For example, the cohort employed between 1965 and 1969 reduced the proportion with less than 12 years of education from 3 percent at time of entry to less than 1 percent in 1974. Similarly, there was an increase in the proportion of officers with 17 or more years of education from 19.6 percent at time of entry to 41 percent in 1974. Similar patterns may be noted in each of the entry period cohorts.

To summarize this analysis, it appears that the stability in the educational attainment of probation and parole officers over time is the result of a significant pattern of educational upgrading. The pattern of improvement in entry-level attainment is similar to that found in the other areas of corrections; thus, it is suggestive of further improvement in the future.

5. *The educational attainment of probation and parole officers by geographic region*. The analysis of the educational attainment of adult and juvenile corrections custody personnel revealed certain patterns relative to the geographic location of the personnel. In adult corrections the difference between regions was a South non-South distinction. In juvenile corrections the difference between regions was an East-West distinction. In each case the latter regions appeared to employ persons with a relatively higher level of education than the former regions. In probation and parole, Table V–25 indicates that the patterns of attainment by region reveal no generalizable line of distinction, the level of attainment varying within relatively narrow ranges. The median level of education in each region is about 16.75 years. The region with the highest median attainment is, as in both adult and juvenile corrections, the Pacific region with a 16.92 year median attainment. The region with the lowest median attainment is the South Atlantic region with 16.61 years of education. Although these differences suggest a similarity between educational attainment patterns in probation and parole and the other areas of corrections, the differences are themselves not large enough to suggest meaningful distinctions between regions.

Similarly, no patterns emerge with respect to the proportion of officers meeting or exceeding the recommended standard of a college level degree. The

Table V–25

Educational Attainment of Probation and Parole Officers, by Census Region, 1974

(Percent of officers)

Census Region*	Years of Education						
	Total	Less Than 12 Years	12 Years	13–15 Years	16 Years	17 Years or More	Median Years of Education
U.S. Total	**100.0**	**0.9**	**5.3**	**7.5**	**47.3**	**38.9**	**16.77**
New England	100.0	0.2	9.4	9.0	42.1	38.9	16.74
Middle Atlantic	100.0	0.9	5.2	7.2	40.5	46.1	16.91
East North Central	100.0	1.6	11.3	10.0	40.0	37.0	16.68
West North Central	100.0	0.0	3.5	10.9	49.2	36.2	16.72
South Atlantic	100.0	1.2	4.3	5.4	64.3	24.7	16.61
East South Central	100.0	1.1	8.5	9.0	48.6	32.5	16.64
West South Central	100.0	1.0	7.7	10.4	40.5	40.2	16.76
Mountain	100.0	0.4	5.9	13.3	45.6	34.6	16.66
Pacific	100.0	0.8	1.6	4.9	46.5	46.2	16.92

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

* For a description of the states contained within each region see Table V–15.

region with the largest proportion of officers with less than 16 years of education is the East North Central region at approximately 23 percent. However, four other regions employ probation and parole officers with less than 16 years of attainment in proportions in excess of 18 percent: the New England region, the two South Central regions, and the Mountain region. In short, the educational attainment of probation and parole officers does not appear to vary significantly along regional lines either with respect to general attainment levels or in the proportion of officers failing to meet recommended standards.

D. Assessment of Correctional Treatment Personnel: Standards and Levels

1. *Standards*. The variety of professions and occupations in corrections involved in what is termed here the "treatment" function necessarily complicates the analysis of educational attainment, particularly in view of the limited nature of the information available to this study. The standards for the educational preparation of "treatment" or "programmatic" personnel are often set outside the area of corrections, as in the case of psychiatrists and psychologists, or they are established by state-level bodies for an occupation in general, as in the case of academic and vocational teachers. In some instances, as in the case of the "counselor" position, the occupation varies among agencies in terms of duties or level of responsibility. Thus, it is possible to speak of standards only in a relative sense for many of the positions under consideration here.

The occupations to be discussed here include the following:

- Academic teachers
- Vocational teachers
- Psychologists
- Counselors
- Vocational counselors

Certain other programmatic occupations in corrections are not discussed here, primarily because of limited information but also because the standards of the occupation are established outside corrections by recognized professional associations. These occupations include medical personnel, psychiatrists, and chaplains.

a. *Academic teachers*. Among the various professional treatment personnel working in corrections the most intense interest has been directed toward the field-treatment occupations in probation and parole. Considerably less attention has been paid to the other treatment occupations, particularly those found in the institutional setting. Thus, the amount of information concerning these other positions is rather limited. An integral part of the corrections treatment system is the educational component, embodied in the person of the academic and vocational teacher.

The national commissions and professional associations have commented upon the academic qualifications of persons employed as academic teachers in corrections. In general the standards proposed are consistent. In 1973, the National Advisory Commission proposed that

> . . . in addition to meeting State certification requirements, teachers should have additional course work in social education, reading instruction, and abnormal psychology. Teachers in juvenile institutions should also be certified to teach exceptional children, have experience teaching inner city children, and have expertise in educational technology.[14]

In terms of educational preparation, the requirement of state certification can be translated to mean a minimum of a "bachelor's degree with an emphasis on preparation for teaching." This was the finding of the Greenleigh Associates' report prepared for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.[15]

The American Correctional Association, however, has suggested a further refinement of this standard. It suggests that

> . . . teaching within the confines of an institution requires a staff of unusual ability. Since institutions for the training of teachers are not geared to the training of correctional institution employees, it is desirable to arrange with the training authorities to provide courses designed to improve the performance of the educational staff. Such courses as Principles of Guidance, Counseling Theory and Practice, Applied Psychology, Occupational Information, Abnormal Psychology, Remedial Reading, Developmental Reading, Shop Management, and Understanding the Delinquent and Criminal—toward work with delinquents and criminals—are recommended.[16]

Directors of educational programs in corrections are an additional source of standards with respect to the educational preparation of academic teachers. Dell'Apa, in 1973, reported on a survey of correctional education directors. The central finding of the study was that academic teachers were generally required to provide basic educational skills that in the general population are usually provided at the elementary school level.[17] The most appropriate preparation suggested by the educational directors would be in the following areas:

- Special education with particular emphasis in reading and dealing with learning difficulties.
- Guidance and counseling with an emphasis upon abnormal psychology and teaching the emotionally disturbed.
- The behavioral sciences, particularly psychology and sociology.

Additional qualifications suggested were a complete mastery of the given subject area taught, basic training in the provision of individualized instruction, and a familiarity with techniques designed for the teaching of adults.[18]

b. *Vocational teachers*. In most institutions the academic educational program is combined with some form of vocational training. The training component of the treatment program may take on three distinct forms.

The first of these may be called "formal vocational training," in which inmates are provided with direct and structured instruction in one or more vocational skills.

The second form is generally called "prison industries," in which inmates are employed in a particular trade or occupation within the institution. In some cases prison industries are structured so as to relate directly to the formal training program. In many cases, however, the industries are operated independently of the structured training program, and the inmate is required to develop vocational skills through informal or on-the-job practice.

The final form of vocational treatment may be called "institutional maintenance." In this instance the inmate is primarily involved in tasks that are directly related to the upkeep of the prison facility. Under this system the skills developed by the inmates are not usually related to a structured program of instruction but merely serve to defray the costs of operating the facility. Thus, the development of marketable skills in the inmate is often a secondary purpose of the system.[19]

Each of these forms of vocational training suggests a different role for the personnel employed in the program. In institutional maintenance programs, the role of the personnel is little more than supervisory, and unless somehow geared to the formal vocational training program, would not appear to require more than a minimal level of specialized education. In prison-industry programs, the role of correctional personnel would necessarily vary with the primary purpose of the program. Thus, of the three forms of vocational training, the only program that would appear to require some form of formal educational preparation on the part of correctional personnel would be the formal vocational training program.

National commissions and professional associations have suggested few formal standards for persons employed as vocational instructors other than that they be "licensed or credentialed under rules and regulations for public education in the state or jurisdiction," the standard proposed by the Peterson Commission in 1973.[20] The Greenleigh Report, however, has pointed out that such a standard does not imply a uniform set of qualifications. This report suggested that:

> . . . in most states, this license may be obtained not only through specific academic preparation, but through various combinations of vocational skills and academic training. Many vocational teachers are recruited directly from the ranks of industry, skilled craftsmen, or journeymen. In some states those who possess the requisite level of vocational competence, generally defined as a certain number of years of experience, may obtain vocational teaching licenses by completing a minimal number of courses in teaching methods. Training programs for adults are most likely to use experienced workers without specific preparation as teachers.[21]

c. *Psychologists*. It has been the common practice in corrections to assign occupational titles to persons employed in certain positions that suggest a professional level of expertise, without regard to the actual status of the employee with respect to recognized professional standards. Because this has apparently been particularly true with respect to the position of correctional psychologist, it is difficult to address the question of the educational preparation of such personnel.

The national commissions and professional associations have clearly stated the standard for persons employed as correctional psychologists. The American Correctional Association has stated that

> . . . clinical psychologists [should] possess a minimum of a Ph.D. in clinical psychology from a graduate school approved by the American Psychological Association.[22]

The Joint Commission found that this standard does not easily admit revision. The Greenleigh Report, mandated by the Joint Commission, suggests the following:

> Although bachelor's degrees are granted in psychology, and many persons are employed as "psychologists" on the basis of these degrees, most authorities would agree that at least a master's degree, and preferably a doctorate should be prerequisite for the practice of clinical psychology or diagnostic functions. The American Psychological Association does not admit those with less than the Ph.D. to full membership status and such persons are not considered "real psychologists" by training conferences or by the most prestigious universities.[23]

d. *Counselors*. As in the case of psychologists, the term "counselor" in corrections may or may not refer to a person with formal educational preparation in counseling. The term has been used to refer to nonprofessional staff and to untrained volunteers in the correctional setting. The standards that have been established in this area reflect this multiple usage.

National commissions and professional associations have not examined the particular role of the counselor in great detail. The National Advisory Commission suggested that for the position of counselor supervisor the educational requirement should be a bachelor's degree with training in social work, group work, and counseling psychology. Such a person, it was felt, would be qualified to supervise and train a non-professional counseling staff, and to train paraprofessionals, volunteers, and ex-offenders working on a counseling staff.[24]

The Greenleigh Associates report adopted a more stringent definition of a professional counselor. The report indicated that there were at least eight separate categories of counselor recognized by the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Each of these areas was found to have varying qualifications for full professional status, but the most common requirement was a master's degree or one or two years of graduate-level education. The report also noted that, in the counseling field in general, this standard was not met in the majority of cases.[25]

The educational attainment of persons employed as counselors in corrections is not known. None of the major studies focus upon this particular occupation and, given the nebulous definition applied to the term in corrections, it would be difficult to determine the educational makeup of the group.

The American Correctional Association has endorsed the recruitment of counseling personnel from among the line staff, and, more importantly, has suggested that counseling be considered a general function for all staff.[26] The distinction between counseling as a specific occupation and as a generic function performed by a variety of personnel, is not always clear in usage within the correctional system.

Vocational counselors constitute a distinct class of counselors of great potential importance in corrections. However, the development of a distinct occupation of this sort in corrections does not appear to have occurred. In many cases vocational teachers are called upon to perform this function in addition to their teaching duties. However, Levy found in

1975 that the primary problem in this area was not an inability to recruit qualified personnel, although that too was a problem, but the lack of any organized effort to provide vocational counseling in many corrections agencies.[27] Thus the issue with respect to vocational counseling is primarily administrative and not merely a matter of manpower or educational qualifications.

To summarize the standards for correctional treatment personnel it appears that an absolute minimum educational preparation would be a college-level education. Further evidence to this effect may be found in the occupational analysis performed by NMS for the correctional counselor position. Chart V–2 lists the various duties performed by correctional counselors. The order of the tasks is based upon two criteria: the proportion of incumbent personnel performing the tasks and the amount of time the incumbents indicated they devoted to each task.

Incumbent officers were asked to rank three areas of preparation, indicating whether formal education, formal training, or on-the-job training was the principal means by which they learned to perform the task. Unlike custodial personnel, correctional counselors generally ranked formal education first or second as the source of preparation for these key roles. Although on-the-job training was the primary source of preparation most often mentioned, it appears that for certain tasks, particularly the actual provision of counseling services, academic preparation is often an important source of background.

Incumbents were also asked to indicate what form of preparation was the best way to learn the various tasks, and for which tasks a college-level education was essential. Academic preparation or college level courses were thought to be essential for such tasks as providing individual counseling, conducting tests, assessing information received about inmates, and the developing of treatment plans. In short, a substantial portion of the correctional counselor's functions are based heavily, and in some cases exclusively, upon preparation received in an academic setting.

Generalizing from the standards and the occupational assessment presented here, it is possible to set as a minimum requirement the attainment of a bachelor's degree for persons employed in rehabilitative functions in corrections. The standard, however, applies primarily to persons providing direct services or supervising those who provide such services. The use of volunteers, paraprofessionals, or other non-professional level personnel in these programs implies that less educational preparation may be accepted for some programmatic positions.

Chart V–2

Tasks Performed by Counselors in Adult Corrections Institutions

• Interviews client and administers tests to identify and classify client's skills, abilities, and interests.

•* Establishes periodic verbal or personal contact schedule with client and interviews client on conformance to conditions of incarceration.

•* Establishes and posts case file and evaluates information to determine client's progress and needs.

• Receives and takes action on complaints against client.

•* Negotiates and develops individual treatment program for corrections client and assists client in implementing program.

•* Advises and counsels clients, individually or in groups, concerning conditions of incarceration, employment, housing, education, community services, and management of personal affairs to establish realistic and socially acceptable behavior patterns.

• Advises and counsels client's family, or complainants, on problems in dealing with client.

•* Prepares recommendations, reports, and dispositional plans on clients for court, parole board, or classification board.

• Testifies at judicial proceedings, parole boards or committees as expert witness to evaluate client progress, and assists in decisionmaking.

• Establishes and develops contact with potential employers of clients.

• Contacts and consults with community agencies, individuals, and commercial firms to evaluate and establish resources for client treatment and assistance.

• Promotes and explains correctional programs to improve public understanding and support of programs.

• Coordinates use of citizen volunteers in correctional activities.

• Attends meetings, hearings, and legal proceedings to gather and exchange information and provide input to decisions regarding clients.

• Coordinates information and plans concerning clients among law enforcement/criminal justice agencies, client's family, community agencies, and commercial firms.

---

*The most critical tasks, in terms of percent of incumbents reporting they performed them and the amount of time spent on them. These tasks represent core job activities in that they involve direct contact with the client or entail recommendations and decisions based on relevant client information.

Source: NMS Field Job Analysis, 1975.

2. *The educational levels of attainment of correctional line treatment personnel*. The assessment of current educational levels among correctional treatment personnel will focus primarily upon that portion of these personnel failing to meet the minimum standard of a bachelor's degree, presuming that,

whatever other educational requirements may exist for specific occupations, the evidence of educational attainment below these levels is the clearest indication of deficiency in this area. This approach is primarily necessitated by the methodological difficulties entailed in disaggregating the total treatment population into specific occupations. The relatively small size of the population used makes the use of the entire population as an aggregate preferable even though it limits the range of conclusions that can be made about the educational attainment of specific areas.

Table V–26 presents the educational distribution of correctional treatment personnel in adult and juvenile agencies. The table indicates that the educational attainment of adult treatment personnel is marginally better than that of juvenile treatment personnel. However, in both areas a large proportion of persons employed fail to meet the minimum requirement of 16 years of education. In adult corrections, the proportion below this level is 38.2 percent, while in juvenile corrections it is 44.6 percent. Presuming the marginal acceptability of an educational attainment of some college, or 13 to 15 years of education, 15.6 percent of adult treatment personnel and 19.8 percent of juvenile treatment personnel still fall below the standard. In short, a significant proportion of correctional treatment personnel can be regarded as having an educational attainment below that thought to be minimally necessary by the various national commissions and associations and also the level suggested by the occupational analysis.

Table V–27 presents the distribution of adult and juvenile corrections line treatment personnel by actual degree attainment. The table reinforces the finding that adult treatment personnel are somewhat better educated than juvenile corrections, although the data suggest that juvenile corrections employs a larger proportion below the standard than adult corrections.

Table V–26

Number of Years of Education Attained by Adult and Juvenile Corrections Line Treatment Personnel in 1974

Years of Education	Adult Corrections	Juvenile Corrections
Number of respondents	3,597	5,349
Total	**100%**	**100%**
8 years or less	0.4	0.8
9–11 years	1.2	3.7
12 years	14.7	15.3
13–15 years	21.9	24.8
16 years	29.9	36.8
17 years or more	32.0	18.6
Average years of education	15.6	14.9

Source: U.S. Brueau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–27

Degrees Held by Adult and Juvenile Corrections Line Treatment Personnel in 1974

Degrees Held	Adult Corrections	Juvenile Corrections
Number of respondents	2,415	3,044
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
Associate	8.4	7.9
Bachelor's	57.4	75.8
Master's	28.0	13.2
Doctorate	1.1	0.2
Professional	1.6	0.8
Other	3.4	2.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

E. Efforts To Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Adult Corrections Officers

The level of education attained by correctional personnel has reflected, and will probably continue to reflect, the various policies toward education maintained by correctional agencies. These policies are the educational level required of new personnel at entry, the educational level required for promotion, and the various policies maintained by the agency to encourage or facilitate further educational attainment.

In adult corrections the prospect that entry-level educational requirements will be raised appears to be minimal. Approximately 92 percent of correctional executives responding indicated that it was likely or virtually certain that entry-level requirements would not be raised within two years. Further, 6 of the remaining 8 percent responding indicated that an upgrading of current requirements was only a possibility, and only 2 percent rated such an upgrading as a near certainty. Thus, whatever upgrading in the educational attainment of adult corrections officers may take place within the immediate future is most likely to be the result of the recruitment of persons above existing educational requirements and/or the upgrading of existing staff.

Assessment of the first of these factors can only be determined on the basis of past experience and will be fully discussed in the section of this chapter concerning educational projections. This section will deal primarily with efforts to upgrade current staff through promotional and other policies.

In order to assess the current effort to raise the educational attainment of adult corrections officers, it is useful to examine the following factors: first, the general attitude of correctional executives toward continuing education for their staff; second, the opinion of executives regarding the most effective means of raising educational levels; third, the actual level of effort being made by adult corrections agencies to raise educational attainment; and fourth, evidence of actual upgrading in educational attainment among adult corrections officers.

In general, adult corrections executives support the concept of continuing education for their incumbent staff. Approximately 96 percent of executives responding felt that correctional institutions should encourage officers to pursue a college degree after beginning their educational career. None of the respondents indicated that officers should be discouraged from such a pursuit, and only 4 percent felt that it was not a matter upon which the institution should take a position.

Given this substantial support for continuing education, the opinions of executives regarding the most effective means of encouraging or facilitating continuing education as a matter of policy becomes important. Based upon a ranking of four types of policies by executives, it was suggested that the most effective policies were those that provided tangible benefits in the form of increased pay or promotional opportunities for officers continuing their education. After this, direct subsidies for books and/or tuition were thought to provide a substantially effective incentive, followed by policies permitting time off for officers to attend class or adjusting work schedules to facilitate attendance.

The actual policies established to encourage continuing education reflect a more cautious pattern of thinking on the part of executives. Although the use of pay incentives was thought to be the most effective device to encourage continuing education, only 18 percent of the agencies had implemented such a policy. However, 58 percent of all agencies responding indicated that they utilized academic achievement as a criterion in determining eligibility for promotion; and 41 percent reported the payment of subsidies for books and tuition. The most frequently utilized policy device was the practice of adjusting work schedules, established by 85 percent of agencies responding, but only 31 percent of the agencies permitted time off from work to facilitate class attendance.

Taken together, these responses indicate that the level of support for continuing education is relatively high in adult corrections and that certain concrete policies have been developed in a fairly large proportion of agencies to encourage the pursuit of higher education. However, the nature of these incentives appear to be not necessarily the most effective means of encouraging this pursuit, with the exception of those agencies utilizing education as a criterion in promotional decisions.

The actual impact of these policies can only be estimated very crudely. What can be presented, however, is the evidence of actual levels of upgrading taking place in adult corrections, not necessarily associated with specific policies. Among the incumbent officers and supervisors employed in adult corrections in 1974, approximately 20 percent had raised their educational attainment by at least one full year of credit over the level of education they held when they entered their present correctional agency. Table V–28 presents the level of educational upgrading among adult corrections officers and custody supervisors. The table shows the level of education the person had attained at the time of entrance into the employing correctional agency, and the number of years of additional education subsequently attained. The percentages presented in this table are only conservative estimates of the amount of educational upgrading actually taking place. In addition to those indicating at least one additional year, a certain proportion of those classified as having attained "no additional years" of education had actually continued their education since their entry, but had not yet attained one full year of credit. This proportion can be estimated to be slightly more than 10 percent of that classification, based upon the fact that that proportion of the group reported participating in LEEP. Presuming that an additional number of officers and supervisors had taken additional course-work without the assistance of LEEP, it can be estimated that an additional 8 to 12 percent of all officers had raised their educational level short of one full year of credit in 1974.

Table V–28 indicates that the group of officers most likely to have increased their educational attainment were those entering corrections with less than a high school education (less than 12 years) and those with some education beyond high school (13–15 years). Approximately 28 percent of the latter group and 22 percent of those with less than 12 years of education had increased their education at least

Table V–28

Additional Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Entry into Current Agency, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Education at Entry				
	All Respondents	Less Than 12 Years	12 Years	13–15 Years	15 Years or More
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
No additional years	80.4	77.5	82.9	72.0	88.6
1 year	9.2	4.4	7.8	18.1	8.4
2 years	6.1	5.7	6.2	8.3	3.0
3 years	2.1	5.5	1.5	1.1	0.0
4 years or more	2.2	6.9	1.5	0.4	0.0
Number of respondents	57,675	10,511	31,783	10,748	4,633

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–29

Additional Years of Education Attained by Adult Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Entry into Their Current Agency, by Length of Service, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Length of Service				
	Total: All Respondents	0–5 Years	6–10 Years	11–20 Years	21 Years or More
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
No additional years	80.4	82.8	71.0	78.9	91.3
1 year	9.2	9.8	11.9	6.6	2.2
2 years	6.1	4.8	11.8	6.5	2.7
3 years	2.1	1.5	2.9	3.3	1.0
4 years or more	2.2	1.2	2.5	4.7	2.7
Number of respondents	57,675	53,431	10,220	11,197	2,827

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

one year or more. Not surprisingly, the group least likely to have raised their educational attainment was the group with 16 or more years of education at entry. Only 11 percent of that group and only 17 percent of those entering with 12 years of education showed evidence of educational upgrading. This pattern suggests that educational upgrading is most prevalent among those officers and supervisors with an intermediate educational status. That is, those officers between natural educational plateaus such as those with less than high school and those with some college, are more likely to continue their education than those having already attained a natural level such as the high school diploma or a college degree.

Table V–29 presents the pattern of educational upgrading controlling for the length of time the person had been employed in his or her current agency. The table suggests that educational upgrading was most often achieved by those with a fairly long period of service. Only 17 percent of those with less than six years of service had increased their educational attainment at least one full year, whereas for those with between 6 and 10 years the proportion was 29 percent, and among those with between 11 and 20 years of service the proportion was 21 percent. The group least likely to have raised their educational attainment were those with 21 or more years of service, of which only 8 percent indicated one full year of additional attainment or more.

In summary, the recent emphasis upon educational attainment stimulated by the introduction of LEEP and other programs appears to have had its greatest impact upon those officers and supervisors whose initial education was slightly lower or slightly above the average education of all officers; and the group most likely to have taken advantage of increased educational opportunities were those with more than 6 years of service, with the exception of those with more than 20 years of service. For a further discussion of this see the general discussion of the impact of LEEP contained in Volume V.

F. Efforts To Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Juvenile Corrections Officers

The higher educational attainment of juvenile corrections officers and supervisors in comparison with that found in adult corrections would lead one to suspect that more emphasis would be placed upon education in juvenile corrections and that a greater level of effort to raise educational attainment would be evident.

First, with respect to the prospect that educational requirements at entry would be increased within the immediate future, it was found that juvenile corrections executives were more likely to anticipate higher educational requirements than adult executives. Whereas only 8 percent of adult corrections executives indicated that entry-level requirements would possibly be raised within two years, more than 20 percent of juvenile corrections executives indicated that such an increase was almost certain or a strong possibility. Thus, juvenile corrections agencies appear to anticipate a greater level of educational upgrading merely on the basis of entry-level requirements.

Despite this, however, the policies of juvenile corrections agencies toward the continuing education of existing staff appear to be slightly less well grounded than in adult agencies. Although 87 percent of juvenile executives responding indicated that new child care workers should be encouraged to continue their education toward a college degree, a substantial proportion, 13 percent, indicated that this matter was not one upon which the agency should take a position.

The judgment of juvenile executives concerning the most effective means by which incumbent officers could be encouraged to continue their education followed the same pattern as that found in adult corrections. That is, greater effectiveness was thought to accrue to policies providing concrete incentives such as salary or promotional incentives or the subsidy of books or tuition. Less effective, according to these executives, were policies merely facilitating further education such as adjusting schedules or permitting time off from work to attend classes.

More interesting is the pattern of actual policy implementation in juvenile corrections. Juvenile corrections agencies are slightly less likely than adult agencies to utilize education as a criterion for promotion and more likely to permit time off to attend classwork. Approximately 45 percent of juvenile agencies, compared to 59 percent of adult agencies use an educational criterion in promotion; and 43 percent of juvenile agencies permit time off, as compared with 31 percent of adult agencies. In other respects the policy implementation patterns are almost identical in adult and juvenile corrections. Thus, it may be suggested that juvenile agencies are less likely to provide concrete incentives thought to be most effective but are more willing to facilitate through other means the continued education of their custody staff.

Table V–30

Additional Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Education at Entry				
	Total: All Respondents	Less Then 12 Years	12 Years	13–15 Years	16 or or More
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
No additional years	76.9	77.4	81.4	63.6	84.6
1 year	12.2	6.0	8.5	21.3	10.1
2 years	6.2	6.0	5.1	8.5	5.3
3 years	2.8	3.6	2.0	6.2	0.0
4 years or more	1.9	7.0	3.0	0.3	0.0
Number of respondents	20,708	2,604	6,197	5,733	6,174

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–30 presents the actual pattern of educational upgrading that has been accomplished by juvenile corrections custody officers and supervisors since their initial employment. Again, this table presents only a conservative estimate of the amount of educational upgrading that has taken place, in that it does not indicate additional educational attainment of less than one full year. The proportion of those indicating no additional years of education, but indicating participation in LEEP is approximately 9 percent. Thus the total proportion of those with less than one full year of additional educational credit can be estimated to be between 7 and 10 percent of the entire population of juvenile officers and supervisors.

In 1974 the proportion of juvenile officers and supervisors that had attained at least one additional year of education after entry was 23.1 percent. This is only slightly higher than the proportion found in adult corrections, indicating that the level of educational upgrading among custody personnel in general has been relatively uniform. The group most likely to have increased its educational attainment was the group with better than a high school education but less than 16 years of education at entry. Approximately 36 percent of this group increased its education at least one year since entry, compared with the total percentage of 23. The next highest group was those persons with less than a high school education at entry, of which 23 percent increased their education at least one year. The groups that were least likely to have increased their educational attainment were those with exactly 12 years or 16 years of education, repeating the same pattern found in adult corrections. In these groups the proportions upgrading their education were 19 percent and 15 percent, respectively.

Table V–31

Additional Years of Education Attained by Juvenile Corrections Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Length of Service, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Years of Service				
	Total: All Respondents	0–5 Years	6–10 Years	11–20 Years	20 Years or More
Total	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**
No additional years	76.9	80.1	63.3	84.4	84.2
1 year	12.2	11.5	18.5	3.3	6.7
2 years	6.2	6.0	6.4	8.0	2.0
3 years	2.8	1.2	9.0	0.6	0.0
4 years or more	1.9	1.2	2.8	3.7	7.1
Number of respondents	20,708	14,051	4,462	1,898	297

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Table V–31 presents the pattern of educational upgrading, controlling for the length of time persons had served in their current agency of employment. As in adult corrections, the group most likely to have attained additional education were those persons with between 6 and 10 years of service. Approximately 37 percent of this group had attained at least one additional year of education, compared to 23 percent for the entire population.

In summary, the level of upgrading among juvenile corrections officers and supervisors is essentially the same as that found for adult custodial personnel. In both instances educational upgrading was the most prevalent among those either above or below the average educational attainment of the general groups, and among those persons having been initially employed between 6 to 10 years at the time of the survey.

G. Efforts To Upgrade the Educational Attainment of Probation And Parole Personnel

The analysis of upgrading of educational attainment in probation and parole is more complex than in adult and juvenile corrections. Whereas in the latter two areas of corrections there has been a general assumption that educational levels have improved over the past, in probation and parole there has been no clear indication that this has occurred. Referring to the discussion of current educational levels in Section C of this chapter, it was noted that only among the oldest officers and among those with the longest period of service was there a discernable decline in educational attainment. Indeed, the evidence presented suggested the possibility that educational levels at entry may have declined in recent years, based upon the finding that among officers between the ages of 20 and 44 the proportion with an education beyond 16 years steadily increased as age increased. The alternative hypothesis was that educational attainment at entry may have remained constant but that there had been a considerable amount of educational upgrading among probation and parole officers in the older age categories.

The evidence concerning entry-level educational requirements in probation and parole indicates that there has been relatively little change and that there is little likelihood that there will be major changes in the immediate future. Only 15 percent of probation and parole executives responding indicated that educational requirements would be raised within the next two years. This estimate is slightly greater than that found in adult corrections, but considerably less than that indicated by juvenile corrections executives. Thus, whatever changes have taken place in probation and parole, and those changes likely to take place in the future, will result primarily from changes other than in the formal educational requirements of employing agencies.

Considering the impact of agency policies upon educational levels among incumbent officers, it is first noted that there is the same basic support for continuing education among probation and parole executives as was noted in the other two areas of corrections. Eighty-seven percent of probation and parole executives indicated that they favored the encouragement of incumbent officers to continue their education after entering employment. However, 12 percent of executives indicated that they felt the matter was one upon which the agency should not take a position. This is approximately the same level of support for continuing education as was found among juvenile corrections executives.

Despite this support, the actual implementation of policies to encourage continuing education among probation and parole officers is less evident in this area than in any of the others examined. Table V–32 summarizes the findings concerning the provision of various policy incentives aimed at the continuing education of incumbent personnel in all three areas of corrections. As the table indicates, probation and parole agencies provide incentives less frequently than any other area of corrections, with the sole

Table V–32

Percentage of Correctional Agencies Implementing Various Policies to Encourage Countinuing Education Among Incumbent Staff, by Type of Correctional Agency, 1975

Policies Adopted	Adult Corrections	Juvenile Corrections	Probation and Parole
Adjusting schedules to permit class attendance	84.4	80.7	63.4
Allowing time off to attend class	31.0	43.0	56.1
Subsidy of books or tuition	40.7	39.5	35.3
Pay level based on educational attainment	17.6	18.7	15.2
Education considered in promotion decisions	58.5	45.2	28.0

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Table V–33

Additional Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Educational Level at Entry, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Education at Entry				
	Percent Total All Respondents	Percent Less than 12 Years	Percent 12 Years	Percent 13–15 Years	Percent 16 Years or More
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
No additional years	69.6	46.7	60.4	32.8	74.8
1 year	17.4	0.0	8.0	23.8	17.4
2 years	10.4	10.5	16.5	29.2	7.8
3 years	1.1	3.2	3.5	8.4	0.0
4 years or more	1.5	39.6	11.5	5.8	0.0
Number of respondents	29,923	285	1,542	3,028	25,068

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

exception of permitting time off to attend classes. In all other policies—the use of salary incentives, promotional incentives, the payment of subsidies, and the adjustment of work schedules—probation and parole agencies lag behind the other areas of corrections.

Nevertheless, analysis of actual shifts in educational attainment among incumbent probation and parole officers since entry into their positions indicates a more rapid rate of educational upgrading than in other key correctional occupations (Table V–33). Approximately 30 percent of probation and parole officers, surveyed in 1974, had increased their educational attainment at least one year since their entry into their currect agency of employment. In addition, an estimated 9 to 15 percent of all officers and supervisors can be reasonably assumed to have taken additional coursework but to have not attained one full year of credit.

Table VI–33 indicates that the group most likely to have raised its educational attainment since entry were those persons with between 13 and 15 years of education at entry. Sixty-seven percent of this group indicated an increase of at least one year as of 1974, constituting the most significant incidence of upgrading so far examined. Equally dramatic, 53 percent of officers and supervisors employed with less than a high school education had raised their educational attainment by at least one year. Moreover, the largest proportion of this group had raised its attainment by 4 or more years, indicating not only a broad pattern of continuing education but a significant absolute increase in overall educational status.

Among those groups that in adult and juvenile corrections were least likely to have raised their educational levels—those with exactly 12 years of education or those with 16 or more years of education—the incidence of upgrading in probation and parole is significantly greater. Forty percent of those with 12 years of education and 25 percent of those with 16 or more years of education have raised their attainment one or more years. These percentages are higher than the overall proportion of either adult or juvenile personnel improving their educational attainment.

Table V–34 presents the amount of educational upgrading in probation and parole, controlling for the amount of time the officers and supervisors had been employed in their current agency. The table indicates that, as in adult and juvenile corrections, the group most likely to have increased their educational attainment are those with between 6 and 10 years of service, and the group least likely to have raised their attainment are those with 21 or more years of service.

In summary, the level of upgrading in probation and parole is far greater than in either of the other two areas of corrections. However, the same patterns noted in the other areas are again apparent. Those persons entering with an intermediate level

Table V–34

Additional Years of Education Attained by Probation and Parole Officers and Supervisors Since Date of Entry into Current Agency, by Length of Service, 1974

Additional Years Attained	Years of Service				
	Percent Total All Respondents	Percent 0–5 Years	Percent 6–10 Years	Percent 11–20 Years	Percent 21 Years or More
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
No additional years	69.6	72.9	56.3	68.8	85.4
1 year	17.4	17.0	22.4	16.3	3.2
2 years	10.4	7.7	19.6	10.5	6.3
3 years	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.1	1.2
4 years or more	1.5	1.2	0.5	4.3	3.8
Number of respondents	29,923	19,477	5,997	3,867	680

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

of educational attainment, those between natural plateaus in education, are more likely to have enhanced their educational status than those with a high school or a college-level attainment. Moreover, continuing education appears to be more prevalent among persons now at an intermediate point in their careers: those who have been employed in their current agencies more than 6 but less than 20 years.

The evidence presented here adds credence to the hypothesis that current educational levels are the product of in-service upgrading. However, it does not directly establish the impact of the educational requirements imposed at entry.

H. The Impact of LEEP Upon the Educational Upgrading of Correctional Personnel

In the discussion of efforts to upgrade the educational attainment of correctional personnel, it was indicated that a significant incentive for inservice upgrading has been the establishment of LEEP. The magnitude of the impact LEEP has had upon educational attainment in corrections is discussed in considerable detail in Volume V of this report. In this section, the impact of LEEP in the specific area of corrections will be discussed.

Table V–35 presents the proportion of persons in various correctional occupations reporting participation in LEEP. Although participation in LEEP appears to have been fairly widespread across all correctional occupations, it also appears that certain occupations have made greater use of the program than others.

Table V–35

Proportion of Correctional Personnel Participating in LEEP, by Correctional Occupation, 1974

Correctional Occupations	Percentage of Personnel Participating in LEEP
Total, all corrections personnel	**26.4**
Management personnel	40.0
Supervisory personnel	39.3
Custodial line personnel	25.8
Treatment line personnel	36.5
All other personnel	21.8
Total, adult corrections personnel	**25.8**
Total, juvenile corrections personnel	**31.0**
Total, probation and parole personnel	**38.1**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics, 1975.

In adult and juvenile corrections, greater participation was reported by management and supervisory level personnel than by line personnel. Among the line personnel, treatment employees appear to have participated more frequently in LEEP than custody personnel. Finally, comparing the two areas of adult and juvenile corrections, it appears that juvenile corrections personnel were generally more likely to participate in LEEP than adult corrections personnel.

In the area of probation and parole, LEEP participation was uniformly higher than in adult or juvenile corrections. Thirty-eight percent of all probation and parole personnel participated in the program in comparison with 31 percent of juvenile corrections personnel and 26 percent of adult corrections personnel. Within probation and parole the rate of participation among line officers exceeded that of both supervisory and management personnel. However, the margin of difference does not appear to be significant in relation to adult and juvenile corrections.

The measurable impact of LEEP upon educational upgrading is presented in Table V–36. Utilizing the portion of incumbent officers and supervisors employed within five years prior to 1974, Table V–36 presents the distribution of correctional personnel who had raised their educational attainment at least one full year between the time of their entry into their currect agency of employment and 1974, specifying whether or not they had participated in LEEP.

Table V–36

Percentage of Line and Supervisory Personnel Raising Their Educational Attainment by at Least One Year by Status of LEEP Participation: Incumbent Personnel with Five or Less Years of Service

Correctional Area	Participated in LEEP	Did Not Participate in LEEP	Total
Adult corrections officers and supervisors ----	34.1	65.9	100.0
Juvenile corrections officers and supervisors ----	19.8	80.2	100.0
Probation and parole officers and supervisors ----	33.7	66.3	100.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics, 1975.

The table suggests that at best LEEP participation accounts for only about one-third of the educational upgrading among correctional line and supervisory personnel in this cohort. In adult corrections, only 34 percent of those supervisors and officers raising their educational attainment at least one year had participated in LEEP. A like proportion had participated in LEEP in probation and parole. In juvenile corrections less than 20 percent af all those raising their attainment one year had participated in LEEP. Thus, although the impact of LEEP can be regarded as significant, it appears that within corrections a large majority of personnel have raised their educational attainment without this assistance. As a caveat to this finding, however, it should be noted that a sizable number of personnel in corrections had participated in LEEP but had not yet attained one full year of additional academic credits.

I. Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations

The educational attainment of personnel in corrections appears to have improved significantly within the last 10 to 15 years. However, in a number of areas a substantial gap between desired and actual educational attainment remains.

Considering all three areas of corrections together, it appears that one can roughly order the major occupations as follows, in terms of educational attainment.

- Least educated are the adult corrections officers with an average attainment at or around 12 years of education.
- Adult corrections supervisors are only slightly better educated than their subordinates, but still are typically at the high school graduate level.
- Juvenile corrections child care workers are better educated than either of the previously cited occupations, with an average attainment of around 13 years of education.
- Juvenile corrections supervisors, however, have an average attainment of 14 years, which is only slightly below the level of attainment found among juvenile corrections treatment personnel.
- Adult corrections treatment personnel have an average attainment of over 15 years of education.
- Probation and parole officers and supervisors remain the most-educated occupations in corrections, with an attainment of 16 and 17 years of education, respectively.

Patterns in educational attainment by age are in the expected direction in all areas but probation and parole. In adult and juvenile corrections, educational attainment is better among younger personnel than among older personnel. This pattern suggests a gradual improvement in educational attainment in the past and appears to suggest a continued improvement in the future as the older and less-educated personnel leave the work force. Of these two areas, juvenile corrections appears to be moving toward higher educational levels at a faster rate than adult corrections. Whereas the educational attainment of adult corrections officers remains heavily oriented to the 12-year, high school education level, juvenile corrections appears to have increasingly recruited from among those with 13 or more years of education.

By contrast, educational levels in probation and parole appear to have remained fairly stable, as indicated by the distribution of current personnel by age. Only among the very oldest probation and parole officers is there a significant proportion of officers at the lower educational levels.

A somewhat different picture of the educational patterns in corrections can be otained by examining the educational attainment of incumbent personnel at the time they entered correctional employment and comparing that pattern with current educational distributions. In both adult and juvenile corrections there has been a constant pattern of higher entry-level educational attainment over time, and a pattern of in-service upgrading of personnel after entry until the present. Of the two areas, juvenile corrections had made a more rapid movement toward higher educational levels than adult corrections. However, the principal reason for this appears to be the more rapid improvement in the educational attainment of newly-employed personnel rather than a more concerted effort to upgrade personnel already employed.

There was, however, an apparent decline in the early 1960's in the educational attainment of newly appointed probation and parole officers. A significantly larger proportion of current personnel, who were originally employed prior to 1960, had attained 17 or more years of education when they were hired than in any subsequent group of new hires. The large increase in demand for probation and parole officers, coupled with general shortages of college trained personnel in the 1960's, appears to have resulted in a reduction in entry-level educational standards during this period. However, the trend since the early 1960's has been one of gradual improvement in entry-level attainment, so that by the most recent period the educational level of new entrants was only marginally below that of the pre-1960 cohort. (This analysis makes no allowance for possible differences in attrition of personnel, by educational level.)

The stability in educational attainment in probation and parole is apparently due to what appears to be the high level of in-service upgrading that has taken place in that occupation. The result of this upgrading has been to bring a substantial proportion of officers with lower educational attainment up to levels that approach the recommended minimum standard of at least a four-year college education.

Variations in educational attainment by geographic region were also noted, but unlike adult corrections the distinguishing variable is one of East and West. Juvenile officers in the Western regions tend to be better educated than officers employed in Eastern regions. No geographic variations of significance were found in probation and parole.

Efforts to upgrade educational attainment of incumbent correctional personnel were found to vary among the three areas of corrections. Adult corrections agencies apparently provide the most direct and meaningful incentives to incumbent officers to continue their education, followed by juvenile corrections, and probation and parole. However, evidence of actual upgrading indicates that the area where the largest proportion of personnel have improved their education after entry is in probation and parole.

Assessment of educational standards in corrections were based upon a variety of sources including recommendations of national commissions and professional associations, and the findings of NMS occupational analyses. These generally confirm the prevailing norm of a high school minimum educational requirement for custodial personnel and a minumum standard of a bachelor's degree for persons employed in correctional treatment occupations and as probation and parole officers. On the basis of these standards, it was found that the area most in need of educational upgrading is correctional treatment. Thirty-eight percent of adult treatment personnel and almost 45 percent of treatment personnel in juvenile agencies reported an educational attainment below 16 years. In both adult and juvenile corrections over 15 percent of those employed in treatment positions reported no college education at all.

In comparison with the need for upgrading in the area of treatment, the remaining occupations appear to be within a reasonable distance of the suggested standards. In each case, less than 20 percent fail to meet the standard, and this proportion can be reasonably expected to drop further, given current trends in entry-level attainment and in-service upgrading. In the case of adult and juvenile corrections custody personnel, the proportion of incumbents with less than a high school graduate level of education can be expected to drop significantly within the next 10 years, as older, less-educated personnel are replaced by entrants with higher educational attainment. In probation and parole, the dual trend of improved entry-level attainment since 1960 and a considerable rate of in-service upgrading also indicates a further reduction in the relatively small proportion of officers with less than a bachelor's degree.

Based on the above findings, the following recommendations are made:

- LEAA and the educational community, together with the adult and juvenile correctional facilities should examine jointly the current procurement programs, educational opportunities, and in-service training programs for the purpose of accelerating the educational level of attainment of adult and juvenile corrections treatment personnel. Given the urgency of juvenile needs and the requirement to strengthen juvenile services, first priority should be given to the juvenile treatment group.
- In pursuing the above objective, specific emphasis in educational and training programs should be given to the development of those skills and knowledges which are directly related to the

105

counseling and guidance function as it applies to the solution of juvenile problems. Most of these skill and knowledge requirements, some of which have been identified in Volume VIII of this report, indicate a need for college level preparation, supplemented by graduate study. In the examination of current programs against these occupational requirements, it is also recommended that any revised courses also reflect further impacts which changed institutional or community-based correctional treatment programs, based on new correctional strategies, may have on position requirements and occupational standards.

- It is further recommended that the impetus toward the further educational upgrading of the line correctional officer be sustained through continued support of in-service educational opportunities. Although a college level educational requirement for entry into this position does not seem warranted, a more educated custodial officer force will facilitate desirable job restructuring and the development of broader career progression opportunities, both to line supervisory and managerial positions and by lateral transfer to treatment or related functions.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (1967), p. 93. (Hereinafter cited as "President's Commission").
2. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
3. American Correctional Association, *Manual of Correctional Standards* (1974), p. 171.
4. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *Manpower and Training in Correctional Institutions* (1968), p. 63.
5. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections* (1973), p. 300. (Hereinafter cited as "National Advisory Commission").
6. This, and all future references to educational attainment are based upon a national survey of criminal justice employees conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1975. All numbers and percentages reported are based upon a weighting of survey results to approximate national totals.
7. The future educational attainment of adult corrections officers is projected in Section F of this chapter.
8. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Standards for the Selection of Probation and Parole Personnel* (1968), pp. 5 and 6.
9. American Correctional Association, p. 103.
10. President's Commission, pp. 136 and 137.
11. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act* (1969), p. 30.
12. National Advisory Commission, pp. 337, 435.
13. Mark M. Levin and Rosemary C. Sarri, *Juvenile Delinquency: A Study of Juvenile Codes in the U.S.* (National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1974), pp. 46 and 47.
14. National Advisory Commission, p. 368.
15. Greenleigh Associates, Inc., *Professional Manpower in Corrections: A Report to the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training* (1968), p. 5.
16. American Correctional Association, pp. 486 and 487.
17. Frank Dell'Apa, *Educational Programs in Adult Corrections Institutions* (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1974).
18. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
19. Gerald W. Levy, Robert A. Abram, and Diane Ladlow, *Vocational Preparation in U.S. Correctional Institutions: A 1974 Survey* (Battelle, 1975), p. ii.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 369.
21. Greenleigh Associates, p. 5.
22. American Correctional Association, p. 425.
23. Greenleigh Associates, p. 44.
24. National Advisory Commission, p. 385.
25. Greenleigh Associates, p. 31.
26. American Correctional Association, pp. 432 and 433.
27. Levy, pp. iv-vii.

CHAPTER VI.
TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS

The most striking characteristic of the present period in the correctional system is change. The past decade has been a period of reappraisal for the correctional system as many of the assumptions and principles that have undergirded it for much of this century have come under criticism and a high degree of scrutiny. For example, the rehabilitative ideal in corrections has been challenged, not only on the grounds that it has failed to produce tangible accomplishments, but that it may be inherently unjust. Some critics have questioned the continued viability of parole as it is currently practiced and have suggested the virtues of fixed sentences as against the indeterminate sentence policies that have been common since before the turn of the century. At the same time that correctional theory is being re-evaluated, more immediate problems have arisen in the form of overcrowded facilities in some jurisdictions and a recent wave of major prison disturbances and riots. The correctional system itself is changing as well. Movements toward smaller institutions, the increased utilization of probation, the spread of community-based programs, and the deinstitutionalization of an entire state juvenile corrections system have also created new perceptions and debates concerning the future course of corrections in the United States.

Considering the impact of changes in the larger system upon the narrower area of correctional training, it is first necessary to consider the historical position of training in the operation of the system. As in the other sectors of the criminal justice system, training in corrections historically has not been regarded as a primary concern. Until very recently the basic apparatus for providing training has been almost wholly absent or of such a low level of quantity or quality as to have had no significant importance for the overall operation of the system. Starting from this historical position, the evidence presented here of increased efforts to provide training, even apart from reliable information regarding its quality, can be regarded as a significant change in the larger organizational framework of corrections.

Evidence of the amount of training being provided, however, cannot be regarded as the sole measure of the position of the training function in corrections. The purposes or goals that are being pursued through the provision of training must also be considered. A number of possible goals of a general nature can be suggested. The first and most obvious is to assure that personnel can and will carry out assigned duties within the general guidelines set down by the agency that employs them. This objective involves the provision of basic job skills, having reference only to the requirements of a specific job within a specific agency at a given time.

A second goal of training involves more than the specific job the person being trained will immediately perform. It extends to the potential role of the trainee in the course of his or her career. The purpose of training in this context relates to the development of general as well as specific skills that can be utilized across a wide range of occupational positions. This objective may be described as general career development, referring to a broad category of skills required for future as well as present duties.

A third and more general purpose of training relates to the concept of system or organizational development. Under this conceptualization, training is regarded as more than the preparation of individuals. It is viewed as a device for enhancing the general potential of the organization itself. Training for this purpose is an investment in the system's personnel comparable to the investment made in physical facilities. Under modern systems theory, however, the purpose of the investment is not merely to develop efficiency or competence in a fixed area or to pursue a single occupational goal. Rather, the investment is made in order to develop organizational flexibility and to allow for adjustments in the goals of the organization in response to new or increased demands. In this sense, training is a means by which the organization can improve its ability to govern itself by providing human resources capable of adapting to a changing environment or of creating the necessary changes themselves.

Thus it is apparent that an assessment of current training levels or an estimate of future training needs must necessarily be guided by a clear notion of the purpose or purposes of training. That is, training can be assessed in terms of: the degree to which it provides personnel with the skill required for their immediate occupations; the degree to which it develops potential job skills for future as well as current duties; and the degree to which it contributes to the system's overall effectiveness and flexibility. Presuming that this listing of possible criteria represents a rough hierarchy of purposes—that is, that the purposes are not mutually exclusive but are additive, and that they range from the minimally necessary to the most desirable—it is at once apparent that levels of training that can be judged to be adequate at one level may be found inadequate when a higher purpose is applied. It is also apparent that, given the nature of the information available in this study, an assessment of training beyond the first level—that is, the provision of skills for immediate duties—can only be approached in a tentative and impressionistic manner.

A. Existing Training Standards

A critical problem in assessing training in corrections is the paucity of concrete standards against which to measure training efforts. The few standards that have been defined begin with the generally unchallenged notion that training is both desirable and necessary. Beyond this, however, most standards are based upon generalized assumptions concerning the way training should be structured in corrections. Summarized below are the major training standards existing at this time.

1. *American Correctional Association.*

The Manual of Correctional Standards produced by the ACA treats the topic of staff training extensively.[1] However, the language and content of the proposed standards are highly general and treat the development of training systems more thoroughly than the actual training itself. The length of training and the specific content of the training are not addressed. The focus of the standards is upon long-term career development or the use of training for overall system improvement.

2. *The President's Commission.*

The assessment of training needs conducted by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967 concluded that there was at that time a need to upgrade both the competence of the personnel in corrections and the quality of training provided them. Drawing upon previously conducted studies as well as research done on its behalf, the Commission's report emphasized a number of specific remedies.

First, it recommended the development of centralized training facilities to standardize the training provided to personnel and to assist smaller agencies where the resources are often not available to develop independent training efforts.

Second, the Commission's report urged closer collaboration of correctional systems and the educational sector in the development of training programs and staff.

Third, more centralized planning and coordination of training at the state and multistate level was suggested as a means to rationalize training and to assure the adequacy of resources and expertise for jurisdictions not large enough or not propitiously located to develop their own training programs.[2]

3. *The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.*

In its summary report the Joint Commission repeated many of the recommendations of the President's Commission, including the emphasis on the development of management training; the establishment of national, regional, and statewide training centers; the integration and cooperation of educationl centers with correctional agencies; and the general support of current training efforts through federal assistance. The primary additional recommendations were in the areas of upgrading the preparation of correctional trainers and the quality of training materials and equipment.[3]

4. *The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.*

The standards on training suggested by the National Advisory Commission can be briefly summarized as follows:

- Training should be conducted by qualified trainers.
- Training should be regarded as the responsibility of management and should be provided with adequate administrative and financial support.
- Training should be provided to all members of the staff, including management-level personnel.
- Training should be provided at both the employing agency and in the community.
- Managers should receive at least 40 hours of training in executive development areas each year.
- All new staff members should receive a minimum of 40 hours of entry-level training and an additional 60 hours of in-service training during the first year of employment.
- All experienced staff should receive a minimum of 40 hours of in-service training each year.

- Training resources should be drawn from both the private sector and from higher education.
- Provisions should be made for the continued education of staff.[4]

In general, the national assessments that have been made in the past have not addressed in detail the specific mechanisms or levels of training required in corrections. In the perspective of current knowledge concerning the dynamics of the correctional system, it would be difficult to expect any more detailed evaluation to be made. Training levels, in order to be assessed with any degree of realism, should be based upon the needs of individual states and, in some instances, individual agencies. Although the difficulties of an assessment of correctional training at the national level is recognized, some gross impressions can be gleaned that may indicate areas where training efforts should be enhanced or instituted.

5. *State and agency standards.*

The most important sets of standards for training are those established by state authorities and individual agencies. It is at this level that actual operational policies are formulated, and concrete requirements are enforced. The responsibility for establishing these standards may rest with state correctional departments, state civil service commissions or, in a small number of cases, the state legislature. In the absence of such standards, individual agency administrators may establish policies with respect to training reflecting their individual needs or predilections.

The level at which standards are set varies considerably, particularly as between adult and juvenile correctional systems. Table VI–1 presents the distribution of agencies responding to the NMS executive surveys as to the level at which the duration of entry-level training is established. In most adult agencies the length of training is set by the state department of corrections for adult agencies. In juvenile corrections, on the other hand, it is most often established by the administrator of the individual agency. The authority responsible for setting training standards is apparently, as will be demonstrated further, a significant factor in the general quality of the training provided. Further discussion of state standards is reserved for sections of this chapter dealing with specific areas of training.

Table VI–1

Level at Which the Duration of Entry-Level Training is Determined in Adult and Juvenile Corrections, 1975

Responsible Authority	Percent of Agencies	
	Adult	Juvenile
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**
State correctional agencies	71.1	18.5
Administrator of the agency	13.6	57.7
Other*	12.3	23.7
Number of agencies	197	530

*Includes state civil service commissions, state law, or general state administrative policy.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975

B. Training for Line Personnel in Adult Corrections

1. *Entry-level training*. In 1975, approximately 97 percent of adult corrections institutions provided some form of entry-level training for new correctional officers. This represents a major increase in the provision of training over levels reported in earlier surveys of adult institutions. Unfortunately, previously gathered information regarding training in adult corrections is not entirely comparable with more recent data, so that no definitive statements can be made concerning absolute rates of growth in this area.

Three studies are relevant to this question: the 1965 Pilot Study of Correctional Training and Manpower; the report of the 1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice; and a report of a 1968 survey by Leon R. Jansyn, sponsored by the Joint Commission on Criminal Justice Manpower, Training, and Education.

The 1965 Pilot Study of Correctional Training and Manpower, based on a survey of 334 correctional institutions of all types, adult and juvenile, found that 59 percent of the institutions were providing training to personnel on an in-house basis. In addition, it found that 38 percent of the agencies were participating in some form of general training provided by the correctional system as a whole, and 34 percent of the agencies were utilizing training programs outside the system. The comparability of such information is limited in that the sample included all levels and types of correctional institutions and in that no differentiation between types and levels of training was made in reporting the data.[5]

In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice conducted a more comprehensive survey of correctional institutions and was able to specify training levels in adult institutions separately. The Commission found that 76 percent of the surveyed adult institutions were providing in-service training for their personnel.[6]

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower, Training, and Education sponsored a study by Jansyn in 1968. Focusing on entry-level training, Jansyn found that approximately one-half of a sample of 22 adult corrections institutions provided such training.[7]

Taken together, the studies of correctional training indicate that the proportion of agencies providing entry-level training in adult corrections was between 50 and 70 percent during the late 1960s. It is apparent that, accepting any of these results, there has been substantial growth in the number of agencies providing training since the most recent major study of the question.

a. *Current provision of training*. Table VI–2 shows the incidence of agencies providing entry-level training by size, defined by the number of fulltime personnel employed by the agency. It is apparent that there is relatively little variation by size in the proportions of agencies providing training. A slight relationship exists, however, in that large agencies are somewhat more likely to provide entry-level training than are small agencies. In general, substantial majorities of agencies in all size categories provide such training. Weighting the agencies by the proportion of officers employed in each size category, approximately 94 percent of all officers are currently employed in agencies providing entry-level training.

The proportion of agencies that do not provide training is now very small, and it appears likely that, within the next two years, it will diminish to virtually zero. Among those agencies currently not providing this training, all but two indicated in responses to the NMS executive survey that training would be established within that time period.

Table VI–2

Percentage of Adult Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training to New Correctional Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975

Number of Employees	Number of Agencies	Percentage Providing Training	Weighted Percentage*
All agencies	203	96.6	94.1
1– 24	19	89.5	—
25– 74	41	97.6	—
75–149	37	91.9	—
150–399	67	100.0	—
400 or more	39	97.4	—

*The weighted percentage represents the estimated proportion of correctional officers employed in agencies providing entry-level training.

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

In the past the provision of training in adult corrections has been voluntary or has not been provided universally to all new recruits.[8] However, by 1975 this practice, at least with respect to entry-level training, appears to have been substantially eliminated. Among agencies providing training, approximately 96 percent require training at entry for all newly-employed officers. An additional 2 percent of agencies provide training to all new entrants except those with prior experience as correctional officers. Thus only 2 percent of agencies surveyed continue to provide training on a selective basis.

The low proportion of agencies permitting experienced officers to enter without initial training requires additional clarification. Responses to other questions in the executive survey indicate that a substantial proportion of agencies permit lateral entry at both correctional officer and supervisory-level positions. The respondents indicated that nearly half of all agencies permit lateral entry at the supervisory level, and that over 30 percent permit line correctional officers to enter laterally. Only 20 percent of agencies indicated that lateral entry is not permitted. Thus, it appears that lateral entry does not eliminate the requirement of entry-level training except in a small number of agencies.

b. *Location of entry-level training*. Table VI–3 presents the findings of the National Manpower Survey regarding the location of entry-level training in adult corrections agencies. The table indicates that entry-level training is most frequently provided either at a state training facility or within the facility where the new officer is employed. Because the agencies were asked to indicate all locations where training is provided, the table merely summarizes the number of times a given location was indicated. It does not indicate the relative mix of locations utilized by adult institutions in their individual training programs.

Table VI–3

Locations of Entry-Level Training in Adult Corrections, 1975

Location	Number	Percent*
Within the facility	89	40.5
At another correctional facility	20	9.1
At a local educational institution	3	1.4
At a regional training facility	27	12.3
At a state training facility	123	55.9

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975

*Note: The percentages do not add to 100 percent. The location responses were not mutually exclusive, thus more than one location was indicated.

Table VI–4

Distribution of the Duration of Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975 (Percent of Agencies)

Hours of Training	Totals		Size of Agency				
	Agencies	Personnel*	1–24	25–74	75–149	150–399	400+
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1– 40	25.0	22.5	58.8	30.0	20.6	17.9	21.1
41– 99	30.6	31.6	23.5	30.0	29.4	31.3	34.2
100–160	19.9	20.2	11.8	20.0	23.5	17.9	23.7
161–240	15.8	15.5	5.9	17.5	14.7	20.9	10.5
240 or more	8.7	10.0	0.0	2.5	11.8	11.9	10.5
N =	196	—	17	40	34	67	38
Estimated mean length of training (hours)	107.2	116.6	60.5	97.9	119.8	218.3	113.2

*Agencies weighted by distribution of personnel.

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Comparison of this information with previous studies indicates that there has been an apparent increase in the number of agencies utilizing centralized facilities for entry-level training services. The previously cited Pilot Study of Correctional Training and Manpower found that only 38 percent of all correction agencies utilized "general," or system-wide, training facilities.[9] Again, however, because of the nature of the sample relied upon by the Pilot Study, caution must be exercised in concluding that there has been a trend toward the use of such facilities.

The data also appear to indicate that there may have been a slight decline in the proportion of agencies providing entry-level training at the institution itself. The 1965 Pilot Study found that approximately 60 percent of corrections agencies provided in-house training.[10] Information gathered by the NMS appears to indicate that this has been the most common location for training utilized by adult corrections in the past.[11] The finding that in 1975 only 40 percent of the agencies responding to the NMS survey indicated that entry-level training is provided at the employing institution appears to suggest that there has been a decline in this practice.

These postulated trends are further confirmed by the responses of adult correctional executives regarding the probable location of entry-level training in the next two years. The responses suggest that there will be a moderate decline in the number of agencies training within the facility of employment or at other correctional facilities. Increases are anticipated in the use of state training facilities and in local educational institutions, but no change is expected with respect to the number of agencies providing entry-level training at regional facilities. This evidence suggests that the recommendations of the national commissions that training efforts be centralized and standardized are being implemented, albeit at a rather slow pace, and that some increased use of local educational institutions is occurring.

c. *Length of entry-level training.* Table VI–4 presents the distribution of adult corrections agencies with respect to the length of entry-level training. The table indicates a relatively uniform spread among adult agencies regarding the length of such training. The estimated average length of training among all agencies is approximately 117 hours, or slightly less than three weeks. There is an expected relationship between size of agency and length of training provided, larger agencies tending to provide longer training than smaller agencies. This can be most readily seen by examining the estimates of the average number of training hours provided. It should also be noted, however, that the estimated average length of training follows a pattern found when examining the distribution of agencies providing and not providing training. That is, while the largest agencies continue to provide more training than the smaller, they tend to provide a lesser amount of training, in the aggregate, than the middle-sized agencies—those with between 75 and 400 employees.

Comparison of these estimates with information available from previous surveys indicates that over the past 10 years there probably has been a general increase in the duration of entry training provided. The 1965 Pilot Study cited above reported an estimated average of 69 hours of training provided to custody staff. The most frequently reported range provided was between 9 and 24 hours.[12] However, caution must be exercised in stating the magnitude of the increase in training length during the period.

d. *Assessment of the length of entry-level training.* The use of a uniform standard on length of training to be provided to new corrections officers is a questionable exercise, given the variety of institutions found in corrections and the diversity of duties required of officers in those institutions. The setting of a fixed period of time to train a person in a certain course of study or a given subject can be regarded more as a matter of administrative convenience rather than a reflection of actual training required. However, in the absence of other objective measures, length of training has been used as a rough indicator of the amount of training provided.

Two primary types of criteria can be considered in assessing the length of training currently provided to corrections officers. These are the standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and the various standards established by the states by statute or by administrative policy. Both types of standards reflect considered judgments with respect to minimal levels of training and in no sense can be considered as empirically based findings of absolute training requirements.

The National Advisory Commission proposed, as the minimum length of training to be provided to all new correctional personnel, 40 hours of orientation training immediately upon entry and 60 hours of additional specialized training during the first year of employment.[13] No rationale for the selection of these lengths of training was provided in the Commission's report.

State standards vary significantly with respect to the duration of training to be provided. Among the 24 states for which desired or mandated training levels have been determined, the range of hours specified is between 16 and 301 hours. Only 9 of the states, however, specify a desirable or required period equal to or longer than the 100 hours suggested by the National Advisory Commission. The most frequently specified training periods are 40 hours and 80 hours.

e. *Impact of state vs. agency standards in adult corrections.* In general, it appears preferable from the standpoint of overall training quality to have standards established at the state level rather than by individual agency administrators. With respect to the duration of entry-level training, state-level agencies tend to impose longer training periods than agency administrators. Table VI-5 illustrates this point. Among the 27 agencies responding to the NMS survey whose training duration is determined at the agency level, over half provide between 1 and 40 hours of training, as opposed to 23 percent among agencies whose training duration is determined at the state level. Moreover, among the agencies providing training of 81 hours or more, virtually all are required to do by state-determined policies.

Table VI-5

Duration of Entry-Level Training in Adult Corrections Agencies, by Level at Which Training Length is Determined, 1975

(Percentage of agencies providing training)

Hours of Training	State Level	Agency Level	Total
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
1– 40	22.8	51.9	27.3
41– 80	17.9	33.3	20.3
81–160	32.4	11.1	29.1
161 or more	26.9	3.7	23.3
N =	145	27	172

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Using duration as an indicator, the present level of training provided reflects what appears to be a dynamic process of upgrading in the past few years. Approximately 80 percent of the adult agency executives responding to the NMS indicate that they had increased the duration of their training during the preceding 5 years. Among the remaining 20 percent of agencies, over three-fourths indicated no change, and slightly less than 5 percent reported a decrease in the duration of training.

However, the rate of increase in the duration of entry training is not likely to continue in the immediate future. If the expectations of correctional executives are any indication, approximately 40 percent of adult agencies will increase their training, and a like percentage will remain at the present level.

The distribution of these anticipated changes by size of agency is an indication of the likelihood of continued discrepancies between standards and actual levels. Among the smaller adult agencies, a considerable degree of upgrading in the duration of training is anticipated. Over half the agencies with fewer than 75 employees indicate the likelihood of an increase in training. Among the remaining agencies, the proportion of executives indicating a probable increase in the duration of training is 30 to 38 percent. Thus, the increases are most likely to occur in agencies where the largest gap between existing levels and recommended standards is currently found. Considering this in relation to the employment distribution of correctional officers, increases are anticipated in agencies employing an estimated 36 percent of all officers.

f. *The content of training.* Obviously, the content of the training provided to adult correctional officers should reflect the actual tasks and functions performed in the course of their employment. These tasks and functions can be conceptualized in a variety of ways. In the broadest sense, tasks may be categorized according to the two primary functions performed by correctional agencies: the so-called custodial function, which involves the supervision, maintenance, and security of resident inmates, and the function broadly described as "treatment," which relates to the various rehabilitative programs to be found in correctional institutions. The distinction between these functions, generally, is more a matter of degree than of kind. Increasingly, the emphasis in correctional theory and opinion appears to be to reduce the rigid line between the functions and to consider both to be part of a unified organizational effort.[14] Depending upon the setting in which the correctional officer works, duties may be assigned that comprehend both functions.

Thus, the more traditional concept of the correctional officer as purely a custody- and security-oriented employee appears to be waning, in theory if not always in practice.

The content of training for correctional officers may be grouped into eight general areas. These are:

- agency policies and procedures;
- custodial functions;
- emergency functions;
- "treatment" or "programmatic" functions;
- legal topics;
- human values, problems, and behavior;
- principles of corrections and the criminal justice system; and
- specific skill proficiency development.

Each of these areas is described briefly below.

Agency policies and procedures refer broadly to topics relating to the knowledge correctional officers should possess of the various rules, regulations, practices, and duties required and enforced by the agency; and of organizational structure of the agency itself. The topics in this category include: institutional objectives, rules of ethics and demeanor, operational and program schedules, location of duty posts, organizational lines of authority, intake and release procedures, classification policies, forms and reports, disciplinary policies for both staff and inmates, search and contraband policies, weapons and restraint equipment policies, and employee rights and benefits.

Custodial functions as an area of training include topics related to the skills or technical knowledge necessary to apply agency policy in the area of security, custody, and control. The topics include: observation and surveillance of inmates, personal and area search methods, inmate-count methods, methods for the control of movement, use of restraining equipment, form and report preparation, and the supervision of inmate work activities.

Emergency functions refer to the skills required to apply agency policies with respect to extraordinary circumstances, such as riot, fire, or medical emergencies. Topics in this general area include: emergency plans, sources of emergency assistance, the application of force and the use of weapons, alternative methods to the use of force, and the investigation of incidents.

Treatment or programmatic functions, within the training rubric, refer to the application of agency policies in circumstances where the officer is assigned to perform direct treatment functions, such as group counseling or behavioral modification methods. It also refers to the development of the officer's understanding of the overall program efforts of the institution and his or her relationship to these efforts. Topics in this area concerned with direct program duties include: counseling methods and techniques, behavior modification methods and techniques, group counseling, and inmate grievance or problem solving. In the case of the latter aspect of this general area, where the purpose is merely to sensitize and educate the correctional officer to the efforts of other personnel performing rehabilitative functions, topics include: objectives and methods of rehabilitative programs, officer responsibilities, attitudes towards the rehabilitative efforts, and orientation to the scheduling and phasing of rehabilitative programs.

Legal topics in the training program are intended to provide officers with an awareness of and sensitivity to legally enforced rulings, policies, limitations, and liabilities relating to inmate and staff behavior and overall agency operation. The topics include: relevant court orders and rulings that are applicable to the specific agency or are regarded as controlling upon the agency, constitutional law, the rights of the offenders, individual and agency liability, and the general area of judicial intervention in corrections. They also include statutory and administrative policies and requirements applicable to the area of corrections.

Table VI–6

Percentages of Formal Entry-Level Training Time Devoted to Various Training Areas in Adult Corrections

	Florida (No Date)	Illinois (General) (1976)	Illinois (Vienna) (1972)	Virginia (No Date)	Maryland (1974)	Oregon (1974)	Georgia (1974)	Kentucky (1975)	Tennessee (1974)
	(Percent of total hours)								
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Policies and procedures	12.5	26.3	16.7	16.5	17.8	28.4	17.6	15.0	25.4
Custodial function	10.1	37.5	4.2	3.2	11.8	22.8	6.0	21.9	26.7
Emergency function	10.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	5.9	13.6	0.7	0.0	0.7
Treatment function	1.7	0.0	3.0	12.0	11.8	0.0	14.0	11.0	25.4
Legal topics	0.0	2.5	1.8	10.1	3.0	3.4	18.0	0.0	0.0
Human values, problems and behavior	32.2	18.8	43.5	51.3	17.6	9.1	16.3	35.7	0.0
Principles of corrections	0.6	10.0	7.8	5.0	8.9	9.1	4.0	16.5	0.0
Skill development	24.3	0.0	13.7	0.0	17.6	9.1	20.6	0.0	18.3
Other topics	8.5	5.0	9.5	1.3	5.9	4.5	3.0	0.0	4.2
Number of hours	177	80	168	158	136	88	88	73	71
OJT hours*	40	120	42	0	0	0	25	40	920
Total hours	217	200	210	158	136	88	113	113	991

Sources: See next page.

*Note: "OJT" refers to "on-the-job training". In this context it refers to that period of time recognized by the agency for practical application of training skills under normal working conditions, but under the supervision of training personnel.

Florida Division of Corrections, Correctional Training Institute, *Course of Study: Expanding the Correctional Horizon* (no date).

Midwest Research Institute, *Development of a Master Plan to Meet Criminal Justice Personnel Training Needs for the State of Georgia* (Final Report to the Georgia Crime Commission, 1974).

Department of Corrections, Illinois Correctional Training Academy, *Training Program for Pre-Service Correctional Officer Trainees* (January 1976).

Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, *Vienna Staff Training Project: Final Report* (June 1972).

Kentucky Department of Training, Bureau of Training, *Basic Orientation to Corrections* (January 1975).

Maryland Correctional Training Commission, *Third Annual Report to the Governor: July 1, 1973 - July 30, 1974* (November 1974).

Oregon Corrections Division, Trianing and Development Section, *Minimum Training Standards* (November 1974).

Tennessee Department of Corrections, Tennessee State Planning Office, *Training Proposal* (July 1974).

Virginia Division of Adult Services, *Correctional Officers Institutional Training Program of Instruction* (undated).

The human values, problems, and behavior area consists of those training topics intended to increase the level of understanding of officers with respect to human motivations, criminal, and general behavior; to develop sensitivity to the meaning of behavior; and to encourage appropriate responses to such behavior. Training topics in this area include: the roots of criminal behavior, racial and ethnic culture, drug and alcohol abuse, homosexuality, the effects of imprisonment, interpersonal relations and communication, and abnormal psychology.

The principles of corrections and the criminal justice system area includes training topics related to the ability of officers to understand the purposes and rationale of the correctional system as a whole and the relationships between corrections and the other sectors of the criminal justice system. Training topics include: the history of corrections; the philosophical and theoretical base of corrections; the component parts and the general functions of the correctional system; and the functions of the police, the courts, and the other elements of the criminal justice system.

Specific skill proficiency development, as an area of training, refers to topics taught in order to develop specific areas of expertise necessary for the conduct of general and emergency duties in a safe and efficient manner. Topics in this area include: physical training and self-defense; basic communications skills, such as speaking, reading, and writing; first aid; the proper use and maintenance of weapons and other equipment; the operation of vehicles, and, in some areas, the mastery of foreign languages.

The above listing reflects a general survey of current approaches to the duties of correctional officers and thus does not establish relative priorities among the topics. The variations within adult corrections with respect to size of institutions, program emphasis, quality of personnel, and general organizational practices tend to obviate the usefulness of a national assessment of training content needs. Such specific assessments are best carried out in the context of individual correctional systems.

Table VI–6 presents the distribution of training emphases among a variety of existing or proposed training programs in eight states. As the table indicates, there is considerable variation with respect to

Table VI–7

Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975

(Percentage of agencies training)

Training Topics	Number of Employees						
	Total All Agencies	1–24	25–74	75–149	150–399	400 or More	Weighted Percentage*
Supervision of prisoners	92%	73	93	95	97	91	93
Department policies and procedures	92%	73	93	95	97	91	93
Security and weapons training	91%	69	83	96	99	94	94
Report writing and preparation	89%	73	85	92	94	91	91
Control and prevention of escapes	88%	73	80	90	93	91	90
Principles of corrections	85%	73	80	82	90	89	87
Correctional law	68%	37	54	73	77	80	74
First aid and emergency medical treatment	66%	48	56	88	70	64	67
Race relations	65%	53	60	65	68	71	67
Counseling techniques	63%	52	70	63	64	62	63
Physical training and self-defense	62%	37	54	71	72	57	63
Alcohol and drug treatment programs	43%	30	39	46	52	37	44
Vocational counseling	16%	14	11	16	18	21	18

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

*Note: The weighted percentage column is the estimated proportion of officers receiving training in the topic, based upon the distribution of officers by size of agency.

the degree of emphasis placed upon each training area. Only with respect to agency policies and procedures is a consistently large proportion of time allotted by all agencies. In all other areas there is virtually no consistency in the proportion of time devoted. In the case of the two training programs in Illinois, for example, custodial functions vary in emphasis from 38 percent in the regular training regime to only 4 percent at the Vienna facility. By contrast, nearly half of the Vienna training program is devoted to human values, problems and behavior, while in the regular training program they constitute less than 20 percent of the training hours provided.[15]

Based on NMS survey responses, the primary emphasis in entry-level training for adult correctional officers appears to be on the generic areas of policies and procedures and custodial functions. These topics are covered in the entry-level training programs of virtually all agencies providing such training, (Table VI–7), except for those in the smallest size bracket. A lesser order of emphasis in entry-level training appears to be placed on the areas of legal topics, emergency functions, human relations, and skill proficiency training. Included within this category is the area of counseling techniques. These topics are provided with more frequency as the size of the agency increases, suggesting that they are either less relevant to smaller agencies or that the amount of time devoted to training in smaller agencies is insufficient to permit coverage of these topics. Much less emphasis, based upon the proportion of agencies covering the topics, is devoted to treatment relating to drug and alcohol programs and to vocational counseling. Since these topics are covered with

Table VI–8

Levels of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Adult Corrections Executives, 1975

Content Area	Total	Level of Emphasis			Number of Executives Responding
		Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	
Supervision of prisoners	100.0	94.9	4.7	0.4	214
Departmental policies and procedures	100.0	85.0	14.6	0.4	213
Report writing and preparation	100.0	83.3	15.3	1.4	215
Control and prevention of escapes and disturbances	100.0	83.1	16.0	0.9	213
Security and weapons training	100.0	74.9	21.9	3.2	215
Principles of corrections	100.0	65.6	30.2	4.2	212
Race relations	100.0	62.9	29.0	8.1	210
First aid and emergency medical treatment	100.0	45.3	50.5	4.2	212
Correctional law	100.0	47.4	45.5	7.1	209
Counseling techniques	100.0	47.4	41.3	11.3	213
Physical training and self defense	100.0	39.0	53.3	7.7	210
Alcohol or drug treatment programs	100.0	31.0	43.8	25.2	203
Vocational counseling	100.0	14.7	10.1	45.2	197

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

lesser frequency by agencies of all sizes, it appears most likely that a lack of direct relevance may be the most plausible reason for the lesser coverage of these subjects.

The adequacy of present entry-level training content may be assessed from two points of view. The first is the opinions of adult correctional executives as to the emphasis that should be given to various training topics at the entry level. By comparing the relative weights assigned by these executives with the practices of agencies providing training in these areas, a rough estimate can be made of the adequacy of present entry-level training efforts. The second perspective concerning the adequacy of present entry-level training content is the NMS occupational analysis conducted for the job of adult correctional officer.

Table VI–8 shows the relative weight or level of emphasis that adult correctional executives indicate should be given to each of 13 training topics. The topics are listed in the order that appears most closely to reflect the relative priority the executives suggest should be given to them. With few exceptions, present training coverage closely reflects the priorities of correctional executives regarding the emphasis that should be assigned to each topic. The executives place the heaviest emphasis on topics relating to primary custody roles and general agency policies and procedures.

The analysis of the occupational demands upon adult corrections officers was completed in two parts. Incumbent officers were first asked to indicate whether or not they performed certain tasks and if they did, the relative amount of time they devoted to those tasks. On the basis of their responses a rough hierarchy of tasks performed by a large proportion of officers and occupying a significant amount of time was constructed. Chart VI–1 presents a listing of these tasks in the order thus derived. The chart indicates that correctional officers perform tasks related primarily to custody and security matters such as the observation of inmates, conducting searches, responding to emergency situations, and maintaining the security of the institution. However, the chart also indicates that a large number of officers devote considerable time to non-custodial matters such as advising inmates, assigning tasks to inmates, and supervising their work on these tasks. Tasks less frequently performed or consuming a smaller proportion of the officers' time include: the escort of inmates, the monitoring of visits and prisoner dining facilities, the conducting of investiga-

Chart VI-1

Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Corrections Officer

- Observes and controls movement of inmates in order to prevent disruptions or incidents and accounts for location and activities of inmates.
- Intervenes in conflicts among inmates in order to prevent incidents which could trigger major disturbances.
- Monitors feeding of inmates in order to prevent disruptions, and unauthorized retention of contraband materials and to assure that all inmates are fed at designated times.
- Searches inmates, cell blocks, and critical areas in order to detect, collect, and preserve evidence of contraband material.
- Assigns tasks to inmates and monitors performance of inmates on assignments.
- Advises inmates concerning personal, work, or adjustment problems.
- Responds to emergency situations in order to minimize adverse outcomes of events.

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975

.Chart VI-2

Principal Areas of Knowledge Required for Adult Corrections Officers

- Use and maintenance of weapons.
- Ability to detect cues in order to anticipate disturbances.
- Knowledge of procedures of inmate count and control.
- Ability to resolve problems without physical intervention.
- Search procedures and identification of contraband.
- Use of restraining equipment.
- Sources of emergency assistance.
- Identification, collection, documentation, and preservation of evidence.
- Special procedures for visiting areas, dining areas, and maximum security.
- Knowledge of emergency plans.
- Report writing.
- Knowledge of the civil liability of staff.

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975.

tions, intervening in disturbances between inmates, screening mail, orienting new inmates, and the completion of reports.

The second phase of the occupational analysis consisted of an assessment by correctional officer executives and supervisors of the level of expertise in various areas of skill and knowledge an officer should possess in order to adequately perform his duties. Chart VI-2 presents a listing of the tasks these persons indicated required a high level of expertise. The listing is in the approximate order of priority suggested by the collective responses. The chart indicates that those areas of skill and knowledge thought to require high expertise coincide roughly with the primary tasks performed by correctional officers. Explicitly custodial functions such as the use of weapons, the count and control of inmates, search procedures, and the use of restraining equipment are among those areas generally thought to require a considerable level of skill and knowledge. Human relations and value topics such as the ability to anticipate disruptions and the avoidance of the need for physical intervention in disputes also fall into this category as do emergency-related functions and certain procedural topics such as report writing and the procedures used in special areas.

In the case of both the incumbents' identification of principal tasks and the supervisors' and executives' identification of critical skills and areas of knowledge, an attempt was made to assess the adequacy of the preparation the officers had received before beginning to perform their duties. Although not purporting to establish general areas of adequacy or inadequacy for all agencies, these responses do suggest general areas where training could be expanded or where training emphasis should reasonably be expected. Comparing these general findings with the pattern of training indicated previously may also serve to highlight possible areas of deficiency in present training programs.

Incumbent officers indicated that there were four areas where their preparation was less than adequate. These tasks included: the conduct of personal and area searches, advising of inmates, the escorting of inmates, and the conduct of investigations into disturbances. Of these the first two were identified as principal areas of responsibility, based upon the number of officers performing the task and the amount of time devoted to the task. Thus, training in the areas of search procedure and the advising of inmates appear to be suggested as possible areas of increased priority.

Executive and supervisor respondents were asked to indicate the level of expertise possessed by typical new officers as they began their duties. The difference between this estimate and the level of expertise thought to be necessary represents a "gap" in preparation to be filled through training or on-the-job experience. To a certain extent, new correctional officers were thought to be deficient in all areas of skill and knowledge at the time of entry. However, certain areas were found to have a larger gap than others, and most of these areas were among those requiring the greatest level of expertise. In the general area of custodial and security functions, large deficiencies were identified in the use of weapons, search procedures, the use of restraining equipment, and the counting and control of inmates. In the area of human relations, deficiencies were noted in the ability to anticipate disturbances and the avoidance of a need to employ physical force. Finally, in the area of emergency functions, large deficiencies were found in the knowledge of emergency plans and sources of emergency assistance.

Assessing the pattern of coverage indicated in Table VI–7, it can be suggested that current entry-level training reflects most of the major occupational demands of the correctional officer position. However, certain areas, particularly those that relate to human values and behavior, appear to receive inadequate coverage. To a lesser extent, training in the areas of emergency functions and legal topics appear to be deficient in relation to the amount of stress placed upon them by both incumbent officers, and correctional executives and supervisors.

The principal area where present entry-level training appears to be least adequate is in the area of staff-inmate relations. The occupational analysis indicates that incumbent officers generally believed themselves to be insufficiently prepared to advise inmates regarding their problems. The supervisors and executives equally stressed the importance of the ability to anticipate inmate problems and to avoid the use of force in dealing with inmates. Thus, while training should stress skills in these areas, significantly smaller proportion of agencies currently train new officers in subjects such as human relations and behavior, counseling and race relations, than in areas more closely related to custody or security.

Beyond these more obvious areas it should also be noted that, while significant proportions of agencies provide training in most topics suggested as the most critical to the correctional officer position, a small proportion of agencies still do not do so. These are primarily the smallest agencies. This point is further illustrated by the response of training directors assembled by the NMS to review training curricula. The directors uniformly agreed that the notion of attaching priorities to certain training topics is artificial if it implies the possibility of ignoring or failing to offer training in certain other topics. The failure of agencies to provide training in certain topics must therefore also be regarded as evidence of the desirability of increasing the length of training.

2. *In-service training.*

a. *Provision of in-service training.* In 1975, 85 percent of adult corrections agencies provided some form of in-service training to experienced correctional officers. Referring again to the studies cited in the discussion of entry-level training, this must be regarded as a significant increase over levels reported in the past. The growth in this form of training, however, appears to be of a lesser magnitude than that suggested by the NMS data concerning entry-level training. Table VI–8 presents the findings concerning the provision of in-service training, controlled for the size of the agency. The table indicates no systematic variation in the provision of training by size of agency. Weighting the agencies with respect to the distribution of employees, an estimated 88 percent of all correction officers are employed in agencies providing in-service training.

The present incidence of in-service training provided in adult corrections, while slightly less than that of entry-level training (see Table VI–2) appears to have increased within the last decade and can be expected to increase further within the next two years. Of the agencies not providing in-service training, 79 percent indicated that such training would be instituted in the next two years, and only 21 percent of agencies not training at all indicated that training would definitely not be instituted within this period.

Despite the large proportion of adult corrections

Table VI–9

Provision of In-Service Training to Correctional Officers by Adult Corrections Agencies, by Size of Agency, 1975

Size of Agency (Employees)	Total Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies Providing Training	Percent of Officers in Agencies Providing Training
All agencies	213	84.9	88.1
1–24	19	89.5	—
25–74	41	73.2	—
75–149	40	80.0	—
150–399	68	91.2	—
400 or more	45	88.9	—

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

agencies providing in-service training, it appears that a relatively small proportion of officers attend such training during the course of a year. Virtually every agency responding to the NMS executive survey indicated that no more than 10 percent of its current correctional force had received in-service training during the previous fiscal year.

The low incidence of attendance at in-service training may be clarified by considering the experience of one agency visited by the NMS staff. This agency, widely recognized as among the more progressive in training, instituted a formal entry-level training program only within the last five years. As a consequence, much of its training effort was concentrated upon the dual task of providing mandatory initial training for new correctional officers and for experienced officers who had been hired prior to the establishment of the training program. Thus the provision of in-service training was relatively restricted pending the completion of the mandatory entry program by the experienced officers. Other information provided to the NMS staff indicates that the experience of this agency may be typical.

Thus, in a sizable number of jurisdictions, the relative newness of formal training may be inhibiting the expansion of in-service training. This could prove to be a transitory phenomenon, however, as is indicated by the evidence of the projected expension of in-service training mentioned earlier.

b. *Location of in-service training*. Table VI–10 presents the relative distribution of agencies with respect to the location of in-service training. The parallel table (See Table VI–3) indicates that entry-level training is most frequently provided at a state or regional training facility or at the institution itself. Table VI–10 appears to reinforce the finding that there has been an increased use of centralized training facilities in that approximately 40 percent of the agencies report the use of such facilities. However the frequency of training at the institution itself, 54 percent of the agencies responding, suggests that in-service training remains a matter of institutional concern in a large number of instances.

Table VI–10

Location of In-Service Training in Adult Corrections, 1975

Location	Number	Percent*
At the facility	118	53.6
Another corrections facility	26	11.8
Local educational institution	21	9.5
Regional training facility	24	10.9
State training facility	88	40.0

*Note: The locations are not mutually exclusive. Some agencies report training at more than one location.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

A second aspect of interest concerning differences between the locations of entry-level and in-service training is the relatively broader range of facilities used for in-service training in comparison with entry-level training. The use of local educational institutions, which is insignificant in entry-level training, is reported by nearly 10 percent of agencies for in-service training. A large proportion of the agencies report using the facilities of other correctional institutions for in-service training. From this it may be inferred that, while a significant degree of centralization exists in the provision of in-service training, in many (and perhaps a majority) of institutions such training is primarily a matter of localized effort.

c. *Duration of in-service training*. While entry-level training programs tend to have relatively fixed curricula, in-service training programs frequently are provided on an *ad hoc* basis. In a number of jurisdictions training is offered on a one-time-only basis in order to meet special or extraordinary circumstances, such as the establishment of a new program or the issuance of revised regulations. Thus, the duration of in-service training may vary significantly as a matter of circumstances rather than fixed policy. As a result of this consideration, the NMS survey did not seek to determine the specific duration of in-service training. Executives were asked only to estimate the average length of in-service training provided to experienced correctional officers.

Table VI–11 presents the results of the executives' responses to a question regarding the average duration of in-service training provided. The table indicated that the average duration of such training in adult corrections agencies was approximately 62 hours in 1975. Weighting the distribution of agencies according to the actual distribution of personnel among the various sized agencies, the last column of Table VI–11 indicates that approximately 77 percent of all correctional officers are employed by agencies providing less than 60 hours of in-service training. The duration of training provided to the typical adult correctional officer who attend such courses is approximately 58 hours.

However, since only a small proportion of experienced officers receive such training in the course of a year, it would appear that there is a very large gap between the current provision of such training and

Table VI–11

Reported Duration of In-Service Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975

(Percent Distributions)

Hours of Training	Size of Agency: Number of Employees						
	1–24	25–74	75–149	150–499	More than 500	All Agencies	Personnel
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1–39	25.0	42.9	41.4	38.2	62.5	41.6	43.2
40–59	15.0	23.8	27.6	40.0	33.3	30.9	34.2
60–79	0.0	4.8	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.3	1.3
80–99	15.0	19.1	10.3	5.5	0.0	8.7	6.1
100–119	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.7	1.0
120–159	5.0	0.0	3.4	3.6	0.0	2.7	2.6
More than 160	40.0	9.5	17.2	9.1	4.2	14.1	10.4
Average duration of training (in hours)	95.0	55.0	73.0	61.0	32.0	62.0	58.0
Number	20	21	29	55	24	149	—

Source: NMS Executive Surveys (1975).

the proposed standards recommending at least 40 hours per year for all personnel.

The probability that there will be an increase in the amount of in-service training provided in adult corrections appears to be relatively high, given the responses of adult corrections executives to the NMS. As indicated previously, a significant proportion of executives of agencies not providing in-service training in 1975 report that such training will be instituted within two years. In addition, among agencies now providing in-service training, over 70 percent of the executives expect the level of in-service training to be increased within the next two years, while 27 percent expect to see a decrease in the amount of training provided within that period.

d. *Content of in-service training*. Table VI–12 summarizes the extent of coverage of 13 topics in in-service training programs. The topics are ranked according to the frequency with which they were covered by all agencies. In general, the ranking is similar to that indicated in entry-level training programs. That is, topics dealing with matters of agency policy, custodial, and security functions are most frequently covered. Topics relating to emergency functions, legal matters, general principles of corrections, and race relations appear to receive a somewhat lesser degree of coverage, and general proficiency topics and treatment functions receive the least amount of coverage. The overall level of coverage on any given topic, when compared with the proportion of agencies providing training in the topic in entry-level programs, appears to be consistently lower in in-service programs.

It appears that there are few variations in overall training emphasis across the various agency size categories. That is, topics relating to matters of agency policy and custodial functions are consistently the most frequently covered. Topics relating to legal matters, emergency procedures, the principles of corrections, and race relations are covered with a slightly lesser level of frequency. Finally, topics relating to skill proficiency and treatment functions are consistently covered with the least frequency.

Individual training topics are covered in in-service training programs with increased frequency as the size of the agency increases. Whereas in entry-level training programs the proportion of agencies offering training in topics relating to agency policy and procedures and custodial functions is consistently at or near 100 percent, in in-service programs the proportion of agencies training in these topics ranges between 71 percent (in the smallest agencies) and 98 percent (in the largest). A similar pattern is apparent for all other training topics.

As in the case of entry-level training content, executives of adult corrections agencies were asked to indicate the relative level of emphasis they think should be given to the various in-service training areas. Table VI–13 summarizes the responses to that question. Again, topics are listed in the order that appear to best represent the collective priorities of executives regarding these training areas.

Table VI–12

Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training for New Corrections Officers by Size of Agency, 1975

(Percent of agencies training)

Training Topics	All Agencies	Number of Employees					Percent of Personnel
		1–24	25–74	75–149	150–399	400+	
Departmental policies and procedures	82	71	75	83	86	98	88.3
Supervision of prisoners	80	71	72	83	78	95	83.6
Control and prevention of escapes and disturbances	79	67	69	77	81	95	84.0
Security and weapons training	77	58	72	71	81	98	84.2
Report writing and preparation	72	54	57	74	78	86	77.6
Principles of corrections	67	54	66	65	68	84	72.4
First aid and emergency medical treatment	62	58	57	59	65	67	64.3
Correctional law	61	58	50	62	64	70	64.6
Counseling techniques	60	54	72	56	53	76	62.7
Race relations	60	42	41	62	67	78	67.1
Physical training and self defense	47	54	35	37	51	63	53.2
Alcohol and drug treatment program	45	54	41	34	43	57	47.7
Vocational counseling	15	17	19	12	13	16	14.7

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

The data presented in Table VI–13 appear to indicate that there is little difference between the priorities of correctional executives and the coverage presently provided in in-service training programs. The frequency of provision of a given topic appears to parallel the general ranking assigned by the executives. There are no apparent discrepancies between desired emphasis and actual levels of provision of the sort that suggest the desirability of significantly increasing the amount of training in a given area. Indeed, in many cases training levels are higher than might be expected on the basis of executive priorities. A similar judgment can be made when the level of provision is broken down by size of agency.

The assessment of the content and coverage of topics in in-service training, on the basis of the occupational analysis results detailed previously, is essentially the same as that made with respect to entry-level training. The similarity of the overall pattern of coverage suggests that the same areas thought to be neglected in entry-level training do not appear to be more frequently covered in in-service training. Areas dealing wih human relations and behavior and the law are not covered any more frequently than in entry-level training, and topics relating to emergency functions receive only marginally greater coverage in in-service training than in entry-level training. Given the limits of the data presented here, it is difficult to state with any great degree of certainty the extent of deficiency in these areas. However, the similarity of the coverage and the relatively small amount of time devoted to in-service training creates an impression that training needs in adult corrections, particularly in-service training needs, are focused primarily upon the major current occupational demands, and that efforts to go beyond immediate demands are relatively rare.

3. *Training of correctional officers for counseling duties.* Various proposals have been made in recent years to utilize the correctional officer in roles other than custody and security. The American Correctional Association has suggested that custodial personnel could be utilized to perform certain treatment or program functions, including both formal and informal counseling.[16] Attempts to facilitate such changes have been assisted by movements to integrate program and custodial personnel, such as the "unit" concept utilized by the Federal Bureau of Prisons,[17] and by the development of smaller and less-security oriented institutions, such as the Vienna facility in Illinois.[18]

Table IV–13

Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Adult Corrections Executives, 1975

(Percentage of executives responding)

Training Topics	Level of Emphasis:				
	Total	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	Number of Executives Responding
Supervision of prisoners	100.0	89.9	9.2	0.9	207
Departmental policies and procedures	100.0	82.1	16.9	1.0	207
Control and prevention of escapes	100.0	79.0	21.0	0.0	205
Report writing and preparation	100.0	76.4	22.1	1.4	208
Security and weapons training	100.0	67.6	29.5	2.9	207
Race relations	100.0	58.7	33.3	8.0	201
Principles of corrections	100.0	57.1	38.5	4.4	205
Counseling techniques	100.0	53.2	39.0	7.8	205
Correctional law	100.0	50.0	42.8	7.2	208
First aid and emergency medical treatment	100.0	40.0	53.7	6.3	205
Alcohol and drug treatment programs	100.0	34.5	45.2	20.3	197
Physical training and self-defense	100.0	33.7	58.5	7.8	205
Vocational counseling	100.0	19.1	37.2	43.6	188

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

Such proposals have led naturally to consideration of the training of correctional personnel in counseling. The data presented below suggest the relative level of effort being made in adult corrections to provide training in counseling.

Correctional executives were asked by NMS to characterize their attitudes toward this practice, their agencies' policy toward the assignment of officers for counseling duties, the means, if any, by which officers received training in counseling techniques, and the relative proportion of officers actually receiving training in that area.

The executives responded favorably to the notion of training correctional officers in counseling techniques, approximately 88 percent of the executives support efforts to provide such training. More than half of the agencies responding to the NMS executive survey currently assign corrections officers to counseling duties. Ten percent of the agencies assign counseling tasks to all corrections officers; 47 percent assign such tasks on a selective basis.

Table VI–14

Provision and Source of Counseling Training in Adult Correctional Agencies Assigning Counseling Duties to Corrections Officers 1975

	Number	Percent
No training	17	7.7
Yes, part of basic entry level training	46	20.9
Yes, special in-service training course	77	35.0
Yes, officers encouraged to enroll in college programs	51	23.2
Yes, special course at regional or state training facilities	32	14.5
Other	2	0.9

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

Table VI–14 presents the executives' responses to the question concerning the provision of specialized in-service training and the means by which such training was provided. Approximately 8 percent of the responding agencies assigning counseling duties

Table VI–15

Percentages of Correctional Officers in Adult Agencies Receiving Training in Counseling, 1975

Percentage of Correctional Officers Receiving Training in Counseling	Number of Agencies	Percentage of Agencies
Total	107	100.0
Less than 5	5	4.7
5–9	6	5.6
10–24	30	28.0
25–49	21	19.6
50–74	9	8.4
75–97	19	17.8
98–100	17	15.9

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

to correctional officers provide no training for these duties. Table VI–14 indicates that among the 92 percent of agencies that assign counseling duties and provide training in that area, the most frequent means by which training is provided is through specialized in-service training courses. However, the table also indicates that agencies utilize a variety of means to provide such training, including a frequent utilization of college programs.

Table VI–15 presents the executives' responses to a question regarding the proportion of all adult corrections officers who have received some training in counseling techniques. The estimated average proportion of corrections officers who have received some specialized training in counseling techniques based upon Table VI–15 is approximately 49 percent. It will be evident, however, that this proportion includes many officers whose training consisted of brief presentations only, as part of entry level basic training, as well as those attending more comprehensive courses.

4. *Major findings in adult corrections training.*

The analysis of training for adult corrections officers is briefly summarized below. The major findings are:

- There has been significant growth in the provision of training for adult corrections officers in the last 5 to 7 years.
- Virtually all adult corrections institutions presently provide some form of entry-level training to newly-employed corrections officers.
- Although there has been an apparent increase in the duration of training provided, approximately half of all adult agencies do not meet minimum standards for entry-level training suggested by the National Advisory Commission.
- Almost every new officer hired in adult corrections receives some form of entry-level training. However, only a small proportion of experienced officers receive in-service training during the course of a year.
- There has been a clear pattern of increased utilization of centralized training facilities, such as state and regional training academies, primarily in the case of entry-level training, and to a lesser extent in the case of in-service training.
- The content of training generally reflects traditional concepts of the correctional officer's role as primarily custodial.
- Training content generally reflects the priorities expressed by adult correctional executives in terms of training emphasis.
- Training content appears to cover most of the primary duties required of correctional officers as defined by the findings of the NMS occupational analysis.
- The weakest area of training involves the provision of training in counseling and related human-relations topics adequately identified in terms of their utilization by correctional officers.
- Counseling duties are assigned to correctional officers by approximately half of the agencies, and appear to be accompanied by some limited training in counseling techniques.

Given these findings, certain tentative conclusions can be made regarding the quality and quantity of training for line correctional officers. Corrections appears to have made significant gains in the general provision of training for line personnel. Given the low levels of training reported in the recent past, such gains must be viewed as a favorable sign. However, in many instances, the quality of the training provided apparently remains considerably below desirable levels. The duration of the training provided, although a poor measure of quality, remains relatively brief. Such problems appear to be most critical in the smaller agencies and, to a lesser extent, in the very largest agencies.

It was suggested earlier that a major consideration in the assessment of training in adult corrections is the considerable sentiment favoring expansion of the correctional officer's role, particularly in the direction of duties related to treatment. The evidence presented in this chapter indicates that such efforts have already been undertaken to a limited degree in many adult correctional institutions. Most of these efforts, however, appear to be selective—weak evidence of a major movement toward a redefinition of the correctional officer's role. The evidence suggests that these efforts are accompanied by direct provision of some training in the area of counseling for officers assigned such duties. Thus, a basic groundwork has been laid for expansion of the correctional officer's role. As yet, however, the provision of such skills for the general population of correctional officers remains at a comparatively low level.

C. Training for Juvenile Child Care Workers

The preceding analysis of training in adult corrections indicates that entry-level and in-service training are provided by a substantial majority of agencies. In juvenile corrections, the level of training provided is significantly lower than in adult corrections. Thus it is necessary to consider the overall pattern of training before examining the entry-level and in-service components separately.

1. *Provision of training.* Twenty-eight percent of all juvenile correctional agencies in 1975 provided no formal entry-level or in-service training to their personnel. The remaining 72 percent of the agencies provided some form of training as follows: 43 percent of all agencies provided both formal entry-level and in-service training, 21 percent provided formal in-service training only, and 8 percent provided entry-level training only. In short, the overall pattern in juvenile corrections suggests a significant lack of training effort. However, in comparison with the available information relating to training provided prior to 1975, these data indicate small but possibly significant gains.

In the past, juvenile corrections has been characterized by persistent lack of attention to the training of its personnel. The 1967 report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice notes that only 39 percent of juvenile detention facilities out of 242 surveyed indicated that in-service training was provided to their personnel.[19] A more recent survey by Reuterman indicates that in 1970 only 46 percent of juvenile detention agencies provided in-service training.[20] In both cases the reports suggest that the training provided varied significantly in quality. According to the President's Commission, in many cases "training" consisted of little more than staff meetings in which no real training was conducted.[21] Reuterman also notes that programs varied from those providing regular formal training sessions to programs going no further than an initial orientation session involving no professional instruction or resources.[22]

Table VI–16 shows the incidence of the two types of training in juvenile correctional agencies by size of agency. The table indicates that smaller agencies, those employing fewer than 75, represent the principal area of difficulty with respect to the provision of training. Apart from a generally low level of training, evidenced by the fact that only 68 percent of the agencies provide any form of training, agencies of this size tend to provide only in-service training in a large number of instances, and are generally less likely than larger agencies to provide both forms of training. Among the larger agencies the likelihood that both forms of training are provided is significantly higher than in smaller agencies, and the

Table VI–16

Training Provided to Child Care Workers in Juvenile Corrections, by Type of Agency, 1975

(Percentage Distributions)

Number of Employees in Agency	Number of Agencies	Totals	Training Provided: Entry-Level Only	In-Service Only	Both Entry and In-Service	No Training Provided
Totals: All agencies	**377**	**100.0**	**6.4**	**19.9**	**44.2**	**29.4**
1–24	164	100.0	7.9	21.3	30.5	40.2
25–74	122	100.0	4.9	23.7	49.2	22.1
75–149	52	100.0	7.7	7.7	58.3	30.8
150 or more	39	100.0	2.6	17.9	74.3	5.1
Totals: Personnel	—	**100.0**	**5.3**	**16.7**	**57.7**	**21.3**

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

incidence of no training, or only one form of training, is significantly lower.

The actual distribution of personnel in juvenile corrections among agencies of various sizes is as follows: 12 percent are associated with agencies with fewer than 24 employees, 26 percent with agencies of between 25 and 74 employees, almost 30 percent with agencies of between 75 and 140 employees, and the remaining 32 percent are with agencies of 150 or more employees. This distribution implies, when applied to Table VI–16, that approximately 79 percent of all child care workers are employed in agencies providing some form of training. Of these, the largest number are in agencies providing both entry-level and in-service training. However, 22 percent are employed in agencies providing only one form of training, most frequently in-service training.

Table VI–17 presents the types of training provided in the various types of juvenile corrections agencies surveyed by the NMS. Although in some cases the number of agencies of a given type in the sample may not be representative of the entire class of juvenile agencies, the pattern noted in Table VI–17 is indicative of variations in training effort among juvenile agencies in general. The types of agencies surveyed in juvenile corrections are:

- Juvenile detention facilities—facilities providing temporary care in a physically restricting facility for juveniles in custody pending court disposition and, in some cases, juveniles who have been adjudicated as delinquent and/or are awaiting transfer or return to another jurisdiction.
- Juvenile shelters—facilities providing temporary care for juveniles pending disposition by the court or transfer to permanent care facilities, usually without the secure or restrictive conditions found in detention facilities.
- Juvenile reception and diagnostic centers—facilities providing temporary services to adjudicated juveniles in the form of screening and testing, leading to eventual assignment to permanent disposition.
- Juvenile training schools—specialized institutions serving delinquent juveniles committed directly to them by juvenile courts or placed in them by agencies having such authority.
- Juvenile ranches, camps, or farms—residential treatment facilities with generally lower levels of restriction or security than training schools, and permitting greater contact with the community.
- Juvenile halfway houses and group homes—facilities providing residential care but maintaining minimum security in terms of community contact, and attendance at school and/or work.

The pattern suggested is that training is more likely to be provided by the more secure facilities such as detention centers, training schools, ranches, camps, and farms. Less training is provided by juvenile shelters, halfway houses, group homes, and non-residential programs. This factor clarifies the finding that training effort is related to the size of the agency, in that the latter agencies tend to be rather small.

Table VI–17

Training Provided to Child Care Workers in Juvenile Corrections, by Type of Agency, 1975

(Percentage distributions)

Number of Employees	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies				
		Hours of Training				
		Total	Entry-Level Only	In-Service Only	Both Entry and In-Service	No Training Provided
Total: All agencies	**533**	**100.0**	**8.1**	**20.1**	**43.0**	**28.9**
Juvenile detention	241	100.0	6.6	20.7	39.0	33.6
Training schools	116	100.0	7.8	16.4	54.3	21.6
Ranch, camp, farm	64	100.0	7.8	25.0	57.8	9.4
Halfway house	89	100.0	13.5	21.3	29.2	36.0
Reception and diagnostic	12	100.0	0.0	16.7	58.3	25.0
Juvenile shelter	9	100.0	11.1	11.1	22.2	55.6
Non-resident program	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

The type of training provided also appears to vary according to the level of security maintained. The more secure facilities tend to provide both entry and in-service training more often than the less secure agencies. However, significant proportions of all types of agencies provide only in-service training. Agencies in which entry-level training is the only form provided are relatively rare in juvenile corrections. However, this policy appears to be more often found in juvenile detention centers and halfway houses than in any other type of agency.

In summary, the evidence suggests that size of agency and level of security are critical variables with respect to the type of training provided. This is probably attributable to the fact that the smaller agencies tend to have fewer resources and less flexibility of staffing of the sort required for adequate training programs. It may also be possible that more secure facilities have a more stable and regularized organizational and operational structure that permits the development of training programs.

Having established the general patterns of training in juvenile corrections, the quality of the training provided is considered further in the following pages.

2. *Entry-level training*. Approximately 50 percent of juvenile corrections agencies provide entry-level training to new child care workers (see Table VI–16). Although the largest proportion of these programs are in agencies providing both entry and in-service training, in about 8 percent of all agencies entry-level is the only form of training provided.[23]

Among the agencies providing entry-level training, over 90 percent require this training of all new personnel. Approximately 5 percent of these agencies waive the entry-level training requirement for child care workers with prior experience in juvenile corrections. Only about 4 percent of these agencies provide training on a selective basis.

a. *Location of entry-level training*. Table VI–18 presents data relating to the location of entry-level training in juvenile corrections. The table clearly shows that such training is provided almost exclusively at the facility where the new child care worker is employed. Only a small proportion of agencies utilize centralized training facilities, such as regional or state training institutions, and an even smaller proportion use local educational facilities or other agencies.

The pattern in the location of entry-level training is not expected to change significantly in the next two years, although the direction of the changes anticipated by agency executives surveyed by NMS are similar to those noted for adult corrections (see Tables VI–3 and VI–10). The executives indicate that there should be a moderate decline in the utilization of the facility where a new child care worker is employed for entry-level training. The responses also forecast an increase in the utilization of state and regional facilities, and the use of the facilities of other correctional agencies. Most significant is the magnitude of increase expected in the use of local educational facilities. Although the number of agencies involved is small, the responding executives indicate a doubling of the use of this resource within two years.

Table VI–18

Location of Entry-Level Training for Child Care Workers, 1975

Location of Training	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Within the facility	220	37.6
At another correctional facility	20	3.4
At a local educational institution	10	1.7
At a regional training facility	41	7.0
At a state training facility	56	9.5
Other	22	3.8

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Note: The locations are not mutually exclusive. Some agencies may provide training at more than one location. Thus, the percentages do not add to 100 percent.

b. *Duration of entry-level training*. Tables VI–19 and VI–20 show the distribution of juvenile corrections agencies providing training. The estimated average length is approximately 30 hours. The smaller agencies appear to be devoting the least amount of time for this purpose. However, the difference between the smaller agencies and the other agencies providing training is relatively slight. It is clear from Table VI–19 that the largest proportion of agencies provide 40 hours or less of entry-level training and that, in all cases, only a small proportion provide more than 80 hours of training.

Examination of the distribution of personnel among the agencies suggests that the picture is somewhat better than is apparent from the agency data alone. However, the general pattern does not significantly alter the conclusion that entry-level training is neither widely nor extensively provided in juvenile corrections.

Table VI–20 presents the distribution of juvenile agencies with respect to the duration of training, controlling for the type of agency providing it. The

Table VI–19

Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, by Size of Agency, 1975

Size of Agency (Number of Employees)	Number of Agencies	Estimated Average (in hours)	Percentage Distribution of Hours of Training				
			Total	1–40	41–80	81–99	100 or more
Total: All agencies providing training	**282**	**30.4**	**100.0**	**81.2**	**13.8**	**3.9**	**1.1**
1–24	106	25.0	100.0	88.7	9.5	0.9	0.9
25–74	103	32.7	100.0	80.6	14.6	3.8	1.0
75–149	44	35.8	100.0	68.1	18.2	11.4	2.3
150 or more	29	33.5	100.0	75.9	20.7	3.4	0.0
Weighted percentage	—	32.8	100.0	76.3	17.0	5.6	1.1

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Table VI–20

Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Child Care Workers, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies Training	Estimated Average Length of Training	Percent of Agencies Training				
			Hours of Training				
			Total	1–40	41–80	81–99	100 or more
All agencies	**281**	**33.5**	**100.0**	**80.8**	**14.2**	**3.6**	**1.4**
Detention	111	24.2	100.0	92.8	4.5	1.8	0.9
Training school	72	50.0	100.0	63.9	26.4	6.9	2.8
Ranch, camp, etc.	42	38.7	100.0	73.8	21.4	2.4	2.4
Halfway house	32	26.5	100.0	86.8	10.5	2.7	0.0
Other	18	27.6	100.0	77.8	16.7	5.5	0.0
All male agencies	104	34.0	100.0	74.0	23.1	1.9	1.0
All female agencies	24	29.6	100.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
All combined agencies	152	30.6	100.0	85.5	7.2	5.3	2.0

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

table indicates that, with the exception of training schools, the duration of training provided does not vary significantly among different types of agencies. In all cases, a plurality of agencies provide 40 hours or less of entry-level training, and only a small proportion provide more than 80 hours. It is apparent from the average duration of training provided, however, that some variation exists. On the average, detention facilities and halfway houses provide the least amount of training, while ranch, camp, and farm facilities provide marginally more training. The training schools, providing an estimated average of 50 hours of training, appear to provide the most training to new entrants. This pattern is consistent with that noted above with respect to the general provision of training. Both training schools and the ranch, camp, and farm facilities are more likely to provide training and are also likely to devote a greater period of time for that training than other types of facilities.

Given the uniformly low level of training indicated in the data, it would be superfluous to attempt a detailed assessment based upon fixed standards. Only a handful of the agencies providing entry-level training meet or exceed the National Advisory Commission's recommended standard of 100 hours. Relatively few agencies meet even the recommended standard of 40 hours of orientation training recommended by the National Commission.

c. *Content of entry-level training*. Table VI–21 presents a distribution of the frequencies with which various entry-level training topics are offered by agencies providing entry-level training in terms of the frequency that they are covered. The topics are listed in the order of highest to lowest frequency of coverage.

It is apparent that the overall pattern of coverage among all agencies is very similar to that noted in adult corrections. That is, the heaviest coverage of training topics for child care workers is in the areas

Table VI–21

Percentage of Agencies Covering Selected Training Topics in Entry Level Training for New Child Care Workers, by Size of Agency, 1975

Training Topic	Number of Employees					Percentage of Personnel
	Total: All Agencies	1–24	25–74	75–149	150 or more	
Departmental policies and procedures	90.5	89.1	94.0	90.3	89.5	90.8
Supervision of juveniles	88.2	86.5	93.3	81.2	89.5	87.7
Maintenance of discipline	79.3	86.5	80.8	78.1	76.7	79.4
Management of disruptive behavior	79.3	75.7	85.0	78.1	79.2	80.0
Report writing and preparation	67.8	65.7	69.6	68.9	69.0	68.7
Counseling techniques	66.1	64.3	64.1	75.0	72.0	70.0
Juvenile and family law	45.3	47.6	49.4	33.8	38.4	41.0
Child and adolescent psychology	41.4	33.5	39.0	50.5	58.8	48.2
Alcohol and drug treatment programs	40.9	37.5	35.6	24.5	38.4	33.4
Race relations	30.2	24.8	28.6	38.3	40.0	35.0
Sex education	11.1	12.0	11.1	10.7	7.6	10.0
Vocational counseling	9.6	8.0	12.5	7.6	7.6	9.0

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

of custody, agency policy, and security. Beyond this, moderate coverage is provided for such topics as report writing, counseling, and child psychology; and a lesser amount is provided for law, race relations, drug and alcohol treatment, sex education, and vocational counseling. This pattern is maintained with minor exceptions across all sizes of agencies. Custodial, policy, and security topics are covered with uniformly high frequency by agencies of all sizes. There is a tendency toward heavier coverage of topics such as child psychology, counseling, and race relations as the size of an agency increases, while the contrary is true in the case of juvenile law.

Comparing the pattern of coverage by type of agency for the eight topics most frequently covered, Table VI–21 indicates some significant variation. Although custody and policy-related topics are provided most frequently by all types of agencies, they are most often covered in juvenile detention facilities and juvenile ranches, camps, and farms. Counseling techniques are more frequently covered in agencies other than detention facilities, particularly among training schools and halfway houses. Topics such as law and adolescent and child psychology are uniformly among the topics provided with less frequency by all types of agencies. However, despite the variations noted above, the magnitude and relative priority of training coverage does not appear to reflect major differences among types of agencies.

Juvenile corrections executives responding to the NMS identified the appropriate level of emphasis to be given to training topics provided during entry-level training. Table VI–22 summarizes the executives' judgments regarding training emphasis. The topics are listed according to the most apparent ranking of priority based upon the collective judgments of the executives. The last column presents the previously reported percentage of agencies providing training in each topic.

Table VI–22 appears to indicate that, as in the case of adult corrections, the level of coverage of a given topic is in general conformity with the priorities of agency executives. In most instances, there is a correlation between the amount of emphasis executives collectively indicate should be given to a topic and the proportion of agencies actually providing training in it. In several cases the proportion of agencies providing training in a topic is actually larger than would have been predicted on the basis of the opinions of the executives. The single exception is the case of child and adolescent psychology, where the level of emphasis executives express appears to be higher than the level of coverage actually given. These findings do not appear to

Table VI–22

Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Juvenile Corrections Executives, 1975

(Percentage distribution)

Training Topics	Level of Emphasis				Number of Executives Responding
	Total	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	
Supervision of juveniles	100.0%	90.8	8.3	0.9	576
Management of disruptive behavior	100.0	83.7	15.1	1.2	563
Maintenance of discipline	100.0	70.7	27.5	1.8	570
Counseling techniques	100.0	65.8	24.8	9.4	565
Departmental policies and procedures	100.0	65.2	31.0	3.8	575
Child and adolescent psychology	100.0	54.8	37.0	8.2	562
First aid and emergency medical/treatment	100.0	53.7	41.4	6.9	566
Report writing	100.0	42.0	45.5	12.5	567
Race relations	100.0	30.1	48.7	21.2	558
Alcohol and drug programs	100.0	30.0	46.6	23.4	560
Juvenile and family law	100.0	28.1	53.2	18.7	562
Vocational counseling	100.0	15.8	42.9	21.2	558
Sex education	100.0	10.3	47.4	42.3	555

Source: NMS Executive Surveys (1975).

suggest any serious discrepancies between actual training provided and the emphasis desired by the executives of juvenile corrections agencies.

Further evidence of training priorities can be derived from the findings of the NMS occupational analysis of the child care worker position. Because of the broad variation in agency types in which such persons are employed, it is possible only to gain a general concept of the child care worker's role. Particular types of agencies necessarily require other or additional duties of an important nature. Thus, the occupational analysis findings are merely suggestive of the most basic and universal duties of the child care workers.

The occupational analysis of the juvenile corrections custody position points to a considerable level of similarity with the adult corrections custody position. Although it may be inferred that juvenile corrections procedures may be less oriented toward the security maintenance role, a large proportion of the duties remain concerned with the prevention of internal disruption and the control of resident movement and behavior. Chart VI–3 presents a listing of the principal tasks performed by juvenile corrections custody personnel, based upon the dual criteria of the proportion of respondents performing the task and the amount of time they devote to the task. Incumbent officers indicated that their primary duties are a mixture of custodial functions and quasi-programmatic functions. In addition to maintaining internal order and supervising the movement of residents, officers are performing duties related to the orientation of new residents, advising residents concerning their personal and other problems, and supervising residents' activities.

Chart VI–3

Principal Areas of Skill and Knowledge Required of Child Care Workers

- Knowledge of procedures for resident count and control
- Ability to resolve disturbances without physical intervention
- Ability to detect cues in order to anticipate disturbances
- Observation and surveillance of residents
- Orientation of new residents
- Knowledge of procedures for visiting, dining, and high security areas
- Search of inmates and identification of contraband
- Use of restraining equipment
- Sources of emergency assistance
- Knowledge of forms necessary for the movement of residents
- Familiarity with duty positions and posts
- Report writing
- Use and maintenance of weapons

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975.

Chart VI–4 presents the principal areas of skill and knowledge required of juvenile custody personnel,

Chart VI–4

Principal Tasks Performed by Child Care Workers

- Intervenes in conflicts among residents in order to prevent incidents which could trigger major disturbances
- Responds to emergency situations in order to minimize adverse outcome.
- Observe and controls movement of residents in order to prevent disruptions and account for the location and activities of residents
- Searches residents, residents' quarters, and other areas in order to detect, collect, and preserve contraband
- Monitors feeding of residents in order to prevent disruptions, unauthorized retention of materials, and to assure that all residents are fed at designated times
- Orients new residents
- Advises residents concerning personal or other problems
- Assigns tasks to residents and monitors their performance

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975.

based upon the responses of juvenile corrections executives and supervisors. This listing appears to parallel the judgments of incumbent custodial workers in that the skill and knowledge areas thought to require a high level of expertise appear to be logical derivatives of the tasks performed by the custody personnel. Both custody and interpersonal skills are thought to be necessary prerequisites to the performance of the custodial role.

As in the case of adult corrections officers, an attempt was made to determine areas of deficiency in the preparation of juvenile workers. Incumbent juvenile workers indicated that there were no tasks for which they felt they were inadequately prepared. However, juvenile corrections executives and supervisors suggested a large number of skill and knowledge areas where they perceived a significant gap between desired levels of expertise and the level of expertise actually attained by newly assigned workers. These areas were: knowledge of count and control procedures, ability to avoid physical confrontations, ability to anticipate disturbances, orienting new residents, the use of restraining equipment, knowledge of the necessary forms for the movement of inmates, and the use of weapons.

Comparing the findings of the occupational analysis with the coverage and content of entry-level training, it may be suggested that the training provided appears to cover most of the areas thought to be essential to the demands of the occupation. However, certain areas of a critical nature are apparently neglected in entry-level training. These areas relate primarily to the understanding of residents' behavior, not necessarily as a part of a rehabilitative program, but as a skill necessary to maintain the order of the facility.

The evidence of need for training suggested by the findings of the occupational analysis cannot merely be confined to agencies actually providing entry-level training. Half of all juvenile agencies provide no entry-level training. Taken together, the evidence presented here suggests that the primary weakness of existing entry-level training lies in the fact that so many agencies provide no training at all, rather than in the content of the training provided.

3. *In-service training*. In 1975, approximately 64 percent of all juvenile corrections agencies provided some form of in-service training to their experienced child care workers. Approximately 70 percent of these agencies provided this training in addition to an entry-level program. In approximately 20 percent of all agencies, in-service training is the only form of training provided. Thus, juvenile agencies appear to place greater reliance on in-service training than adult corrections agencies, and are generally more likely to provide in-service than entry-level training.

The proportion of child care workers receiving in-service training in agencies providing such training is considerably larger than in adult corrections. In adult agencies that provide in-service training, as noted earlier, in almost all cases the proportion of officers who receive training each year is 10 percent or less. By contrast, in almost half of the juvenile agencies providing in-service training, the proportion of child care workers who receive training each year is over 90 percent. Moreover, three-quarters of the juvenile agencies that provide this training accommodate 50 percent or more of their experienced personnel per year. The overall average proportion of child care workers receiving in-service training among all agencies that provide such training is approximately 72 percent. However, considering that only 64 percent of all agencies fall into this category, and that these agencies employ approximately three-fourths of all child care workers, it can be estimated that only about one-half of all child care workers actually receive in-service training during a given year.

a. *Location of in-service training*. Table VI–23 shows the locations utilized by juvenile corrections for their in-service training programs. The table indicates that, as in the case of entry-level training programs, the primary location of in-service training is the juvenile facility itself. However, significantly

Table VI–23

Location of In-Service Training for Child Care Workers, 1975

Location of Training	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies*
Within the facility	278	47.5
Another correctional facility	59	10.1
Local educational institution	101	17.3
Regional training facility	115	19.7
State training facility	96	16.4
Other	32	5.5

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

*Note: Training locations are not mutually exclusive. Thus, agencies may report more than one location utilized. For this reason the percentages do not add to 100 percent.

more use is made of training facilities other than the employing agency than is the case with entry-level training. Particularly interesting is the utilization of state and regional training facilities and of local educational facilities. The latter location is more extensively used by juvenile facilities than by adult facilities. However, the general utilization of centralized training facilities is significantly below that found among adult correctional agencies (See Table VI–10).

b. *Duration of in-service training*. The average duration of in-service training provided was approximately 35 hours in 1975. This is slightly more than the estimated average of 30 hours provided in entry-level training programs, and considerably less than the average duration estimated for adult correctional officers.

Table VI–24 shows the duration of in-service training provided by the various types of juvenile corrections agencies. The average duration of in-service training provided in juvenile corrections is 34 hours, approximately the same as that provided in entry-level programs. There appears to be relatively little variation among the various types of agencies. In all cases, the majority of agencies provide less than 40 hours of training, and only a small percentage provide more than 100 hours of training per year. Comparing this table with Tables VI–19 and VI–20 which show the durations of entry-level training, the stronger emphasis placed upon in-service training is again apparent. Although the overall averages are similar, a larger proportion of agencies appear to train for more than 40 hours in the case of in-service programs than in the case of entry-level programs. Moreover, a larger proportion of agencies provide more than 100 hours of in-service training than is the case with entry-level programs.

c. *Content of in-service training*. Table VI–25 presents the relative priorities indicated by juvenile corrections executives regarding the emphasis to be given to the various topics covered in in-service training. The topics are listed in the order that appears to best represent the priorities expressed by the executives collectively.

Table VI–26 presents the extent of coverage of several training topics in in-service training, by type of agency providing the training. The pattern of topics covered in in-service training appears to be different from that noted in the case of entry-level training. Although the overall hierarchy of topics is maintained, in a number of cases certain topics are more often covered in in-service than in entry-level programs. The clearest example is counseling techniques, which is provided in almost 80 percent of in-service programs. By contrast, this topic is covered in entry-level programs by only 66 percent of the agencies. Departmental policies, covered in almost

Table VI–24

Duration of In-Service Training Provided to Child Care Workers by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Percent of Agencies Training					Number of Agencies Training	Estimated Average Duration of Training
		Hours of Training					
	Total	1–16	17–39	40–99	100 or More		
All agencies	100.0	34.2	27.7	32.0	6.2	325	34.1
Detention	100.0	39.7	29.4	27.2	3.7	136	27.9
Training school	100.0	36.0	24.0	33.3	6.6	75	37.9
Ranch, camp, farm	100.0	21.5	31.3	39.1	7.8	51	38.5
Halfway house	100.0	31.8	22.7	34.1	11.3	44	39.8
Other	100.0	26.3	31.6	36.8	5.3	19	41.4

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Table VI–25

Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Juvenile Corrections Executives, 1975

(Percentage of executives responding)

Training Topics	Level of Emphasis				Number of Executives Responding
	Total	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	
Supervision of juveniles	100.0%	85.9	12.0	2.1	568
Management of disruptive behavior	100.0	82.2	15.5	2.3	563
Maintenance of discipline	100.0	70.4	26.4	3.2	568
Counseling techniques	100.0	70.2	22.0	7.8	554
Child and adolescent psychology	100.0	61.8	32.8	5.4	552
Departmental policies and procedures	100.0	55.4	36.1	8.5	560
First aid and emergency medical treatment	100.0	48.7	43.3	8.0	556
Report writing and preparation	100.0	41.3	47.2	11.4	559
Alcohol and drug treatment programs	100.0	35.3	46.0	18.7	552
Juvenile and family law	100.0	33.7	51.4	14.9	558
Race relations	100.0	29.2	47.3	23.5	552
Vocational counseling	100.0	18.8	43.9	37.3	538
Sex education	100.0	12.7	50.5	36.8	552

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

all entry-level programs, is provided by only 67 percent of the in-service programs. Finally, topics related to child and adolescent psychology are provided by approximately 40 percent of the entry-level programs, but are covered by 64 percent of agencies providing in-service training. These differences suggest that in-service training, in addition to being more widely provided than entry-level, is also more diversified in content. However, an examination of the other training topics covered with a high degree of frequency—supervision of juveniles, management of disruptive behavior, and maintenance of discipline—suggest that in-service programs remain heavily oriented toward custody and security topics.

Entry-level programs are fairly uniform in the extent of coverage given to the various topics across all types of agencies. In-service programs, however, involve considerably more variation across types of agencies. Juvenile detention facilities appear to emphasize training in such topics as the supervision of juveniles, counseling techniques, alcohol and drug treatment programs, and vocational counseling. They also provide more coverage of legal topics than the other types of agencies. Halfway houses and group homes appear to provide training in counseling techniques, child and adolescent psychology, sex education, and vocational counseling slightly more often than the other juvenile facilities although the proportions remain extremely low in all agencies. At the same time, they provide training in the control of disruptive behavior, discipline, report writing, medical treatment, legal topics, and race relations less frequently than the other agencies. The more secure institutions—training schools, and ranch, camp and farm facilities—appear to be similar in terms of their training coverages, although training schools train in legal topics and topics related to the maintenance of discipline and the supervision of juveniles less often than the ranch, camp, or farm facilities. The latter appear to cover psychological topics less often than any of the other type of juvenile agency.

Table VI–26 appears to suggest that, as in the case of entry-level training, the coverage of topics in in-service training closely matches the priorities suggested by the executives. There are no apparent areas where training coverage is significantly less than would be predicted on the basis of executive opinions.

Assessing the coverage of training topics in in-service training in comparison with the requirement suggested by the occupational analysis, it may be suggested that certain of the deficiencies noted in entry-level training are remedied in in-service training. Greater emphasis appears to be placed upon topics relating to interpersonal behavior such as counseling techniques and child and adolescent psychology, thus complementing the emphasis toward policies, procedures, and custodial functions in entry-level training. Thus, it may be suggested that at least in those agencies providing both entry and in-service training there appears to be a reasonably comprehensive coverage of the primary areas required of

Table VI–26

Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training Provided to Child Care Workers, by Type of Agency, 1975

(Percent of agencies training)

Training Topic	Type of Agency					
	Total, All Agencies	Juvenile Detention	Training School	Ranch, Camp, Farm	Halfway House	Other
Supervision of juveniles	81.3	83.4	72.6	86.8	77.1	95.5
Counseling techniques	79.9	74.8	82.1	86.8	87.5	72.7
Management of disruptive behavior	77.9	78.8	75.0	86.8	68.8	81.8
Maintenance of discipline	70.7	74.8	63.1	79.2	56.3	81.8
Department policies and procedures	66.8	63.6	69.0	67.9	64.9	81.8
Child and adolescent psychology	64.0	60.9	67.9	54.7	68.8	81.8
Report writing and preparation	54.7	53.2	58.3	64.2	41.7	63.6
First aid and emergency medical treatment	54.2	56.3	59.5	62.3	33.3	45.5
Juvenile and family law	51.1	58.9	42.9	54.7	37.5	50.0
Alcohol and drug treatment programs	48.3	39.1	59.5	54.7	52.1	45.5
Race relations	32.7	29.8	35.7	39.6	25.0	40.9
Sex education	22.9	21.2	22.6	22.6	31.3	18.2
Vocational counseling	15.4	11.3	16.6	17.0	18.8	27.3
Number of agencies offering training	151	84	53	48	22	358

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

juvenile custody officers. This judgment, of course, is based upon the assumption that the pattern of coverage indicated above is typical of most agencies.

A more serious question relates to the adequacy of topic coverage in those agencies providing only in-service training—20 percent of all agencies. If the pattern of coverage indicated in Table VI–26 is typical of the training provided in those agencies it may be suggested that there is a neglect of the more mundane topics of agency policy and procedures in favor of the topics relating to interpersonal relations. Admittedly it is difficult to assess precisely the content and quality of the training given the limitations of the methods used in this study, but the pattern of responses suggest that the coverage of topics in agencies providing only in-service training is less than adequate to meet the demands of the occupation.

Whatever the adequacy or inadequacy of the topical coverage in in-service training, the more serious issue is the lack of time devoted to training *per se*. Presuming that coverage is reasonably comprehensive, the fact that the average amount of time devoted to in-service training is less than one week each year suggest that the quality of that training is questionable. Similarly, whatever the other virtues or deficiencies of the training actually provided in juvenile corrections, the large proportion of agencies providing no training whatsoever looms as a serious problem that requires remedy.

4. *Major findings relating to training for child care workers.* In summary, the major findings derived from the analysis so far are as follows:

- There appears to have been relatively little growth in the amount of training provided in juvenile corrections in the last 7 to 10 years.
- Training levels, in terms of number of agencies providing training, remain significantly low, both for entry-level training and for in-service training.
- The duration of the training provided remains far below suggested standards. Only a small proportion of agencies meet or exceed the minimum training standard of 100 hours for entry-level training, and less than 50 percent of agencies providing in-service training meet or exceed the minimum standard of 40 hours.
- The location of training is primarily the employing agency, although in-service training programs appear to utilize a somewhat broader range of facilities than entry-level programs.
- The content of the training provided generally conforms to both the relative priorities of juvenile corrections executives and to the primary skills and knowledge required of child care workers.
- The content of the training itself appears to be heavily oriented toward primary custodial, policy, and security topics.

On the basis of these findings, it can be suggested that the overall condition of training in juvenile corrections is one of serious weakness with respect to the incidence of provision and in the duration of the training provided. This in turn strongly implies that, despite the apparent congruence of training content to the demands of the occupation, the training itself is of doubtful value, considering the limited amount of time devoted to it. In addition, the significant number of agencies providing no training whatsoever further aggravates the deficiency in this area.

In many respects, juvenile corrections is in a position not unlike that of adult corrections a number of years ago. While the adult agencies have developed a significant training effort and now appear to be embarking upon further expansion and maturation of these efforts, juvenile corrections appear now to require the development of basic training structures and a general increase in the quantity as well as the quality of training.

D. Training for Probation and Parole Officers

As in juvenile corrections, the extent of training in probation and parole has historically not been as extensive as in adult corrections. Thus it is again necessary to consider the overall pattern of training in order to better understand the quality of the individual components of entry and in-service training. Approximately 80 percent of all probation and parole agencies provided some form of training to their personnel in 1975. Approximately 50 percent of all agencies provided both entry-level and in-service training. In-service training was the only form provided by 22 percent of all agencies, and an additional 8 percent of all agencies provided only entry-level training. This distribution, while superior to that noted in the case of juvenile agencies, nevertheless indicates a considerable lack of training for probation and parole officers.

1. *Provision of training.* Table VI–27 presents the pattern of training among the various types of probation and parole agencies. Although probation and parole agencies perform similar functions, the organizational pattern of these services varies widely among the states. In a number of states the two functions are combined under a single state-level agency. In other states, the probation and parole functions are organizationally separated between local and state-level agencies. Further differences exist in the class of offender with which the individual agencies deal. In some jurisdictions, services to adults and to juveniles are provided by a single agency. In other areas, each class of offender is served by a separate agency. Table VI–27 presents what appear to be the most common variations in probation and parole organizations. It distinguishes between organizationally combined and separated agencies, with respect to the specific functions of probation and parole services and to the class of offender served.

The principle variation in the provision of training is between agencies providing probation services only and agencies providing parole services only. Among the former, regardless of the class of offender for whom the services are rendered, approximately 28 percent provide no training to their personnel. Among agencies providing only parole services, only 13 percent are without a training program. However, among agencies in which the probation and parole functions are combined, the proportion of agencies not providing some form of training is only 11 percent. In general, the centralization of services appears to be a critical factor in the provision of training. Parole services, usually organized on a statewide basis, are more likely to provide training than locally-based probation services. Similarly, agencies in which probation and parole services are centralized, again, usually at the state level, appear to provide superior levels of training.

a. *Probation agencies.* Table VI–27 shows the differences in the provision of training by class of the offender served. In general, juvenile probation agencies are more likely to provide training than adult agencies. In adult probation, 36 percent of the agencies do not offer training, while among juvenile agencies this proportion is 25 percent. Among agencies in which both adult and juvenile offenders are served, the proportion not providing training is also 25 percent.

The type of training provided also varies by the class of offender served. A larger proportion of juvenile than adult probation agencies provide both entry-level and in-service training. However, in agencies providing probation services to both adult and juvenile offenders, the proportion providing both forms of training is larger than that among agencies serving either adult or juvenile offenders exclusively.

No variation among these three types of agencies is apparent with respect to the proportions providing only entry-level or only in-service training. In each case, the proportion of agencies providing only entry-level training is approximately 7 to 8 percent. The proportion of agencies providing only in-service

Table VI–27

Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies				
		Total	Training Provided:			
			Entry Level Only	Inservice Only	Both Entry and In-Service	No Training Provided
All agencies	1,748*	100.0	8.4	22.0	49.8	19.9
All probation agencies	774	100.0	7.9	24.5	39.7	27.9
All parole agencies	157	100.0	7.6	19.1	59.9	13.4
All combined probation/parole agencies	620	100.0	9.2	20.0	59.5	11.3
Adult probation	184	100.0	7.6	23.4	32.6	36.4
Juvenile probation	335	100.0	8.7	26.9	39.1	25.4
Adult and juvenile probation	255	100.0	7.1	22.4	45.5	25.1
Adult parole	50	100.0	10.0	8.0	72.0	10.0
Juvenile parole	75	100.0	8.0	25.3	45.3	21.3
Adult and juvenile parole	32	100.0	3.1	21.9	75.0	0.0
Adult probation and parole	319	100.0	9.4	16.0	66.1	8.5
Juvenile probation and parole	185	100.0	10.3	22.2	54.6	13.0
Adult and juvenile probation and parole	116	100.0	6.9	27.6	49.1	16.4
Other agencies	197	100.0	8.1	20.8	50.8	20.3

*All agencies includes those listed as "other agencies."

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

training ranges between 22 and 27 percent. This distribution is similar to that found for probation and parole agencies in the aggregate.

b. *Parole agencies*. Although probation agencies generally provide less training than parole agencies, within parole there are certain variations apparent when the class of offender variable is controlled. The pattern is the opposite of that found among probation agencies: adult agencies are more likely to provide training than juvenile agencies. Only 10 percent of adult parole agencies fail to provide training for their personnel, while 21 percent of juvenile agencies provide such training. When adult and juvenile parole functions are combined, however, the data indicate that all agencies provide some form of training.

The type of training in the area of parole also varies by the class of offender served. Among adult parole agencies, 72 percent provide both entry and in-service training. Among juvenile agencies, the proportion providing both forms of training is only 45 percent. However, agencies combining adult and juvenile parole functions provide both entry and in-service training more frequently (75 percent) than either adult or juvenile agencies.

Within parole, as within probation, the provision of only one form of training is relatively common. Among juvenile parole and combined adult and juvenile parole agencies, the proportions providing only in-service training are 25 and 22 percent, respectively. However, the proportion of adult parole agencies providing only in-service training is 8 percent. Ten percent of adult agencies provide only entry-level training, compared with 8 percent of juvenile parole agencies and 3 percent of combined adult and juvenile agencies.

c. *Consolidated probation and parole agencies*. A recent development in the correctional system is the consolidation of probation and parole services at the state level. A recent national survey identified at least eight states in which total or partial consolidation of these services under a single administrative system has been attempted.[24] Many of these consolidation efforts have been motivated by a desire to reduce fragmentation in the probation and parole field and to develop higher and more standardized levels of performance. The NMS analysis suggests that, at least with respect to the provision of training, efforts to consolidate these functions may prove to be beneficial.

In general, agencies that perform both probation and parole services are more likely to provide training to their personnel than agencies performing one or the other function exclusively. However, within this category of agencies certain variations can be noted. When the class of the offender served is controlled, it appears that combined adult agencies are more likely to provide training than combined juvenile agencies or combined agencies for both adult and juvenile offenders. Combined adult agencies provide some training in 91 percent of the cases examined, whereas 87 percent of combined juvenile agencies and 84 percent of combined adult and juvenile probation and parole agencies provide some form of training to their personnel.

The type of training provided by consolidated agencies differs more dramatically when the type of offender served is controlled. Sixty-six percent of combined adult agencies provide both entry and in-service training. Only 55 percent of combined juvenile agencies and 49 percent of combined adult and juvenile agencies provide this amount of training. Within combined adult agencies, 16 percent provide only in-service training, and an additional 9 percent provide only entry-level training. Combined juvenile agencies and combined adult and juvenile agencies provide only in-service training in 22 and 28 percent of the cases, and provide entry-level training only in 10 percent and 7 percent of the cases, respectively.

To summarize, the most important factor with respect to the provision of training appears to be organizational centralization. In almost all cases, consolidated agencies are more likely to provide training than agencies in which functions are specialized. Parole agencies, usually organized on a statewide basis, provide training more frequently than probation agencies. The distinction between agencies serving adult or juvenile offenders also appears to be significant with respect to training. In the probation area, adult agencies are more likely to train than juvenile agencies. In the area of parole, the opposite pattern is true: juvenile agencies are more likely to train than adult agencies. In general, however, the amount of training provided by agencies organized on a combined basis is superior to that provided by other types of agencies.

2. *Entry-level training*. As in juvenile corrections, the provision of entry-level training in probation and parole agencies lags behind the provision of in-service training. Combining agencies providing only entry-level training and agencies providing both forms of training, it is suggested that entry-level training is provided by approximately 58 percent of probation and parole agencies.

Table VI–28

Locations of Formal Entry-Level Training for Probation/Parole Officers, 1975

	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies
Within the local office or agency	665	33.1
Local educational institution	188	9.3
State probation/parole office	376	18.7
Local courts	102	5.1
Other	388	19.3

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

Among agencies in which entry-level training is provided, approximately 83 percent require it of all new officers. An additional 12 percent of agencies excuse experienced probation and parole officers from the entry-level training. Thus, in 95 percent of these agencies the coverage of entry-level training is virtually universal.

a. *The location of entry-level training*. The locations of entry-level training in probation and parole are presented in Table VI–28. As in adult and juvenile corrections, the most common site of training is the agency in which the new officer is to be employed. This location is utilized by approximately a third of all agencies providing entry-level training. Another 19 percent of these agencies utilize state training facilities, and 9 percent use local educational institutions.

In comparison with adult and juvenile corrections, these patterns indicate a broader and more varied pattern of training location in probation and parole. The trend with respect to location, however, is essentially the same as that noted in the other two areas of corrections. Probation and parole executives indicate a modest decrease in the utilization of the local facility for purposes of training and a modest increase in the use of local educational and statewide facilities. The proportion utilizing local courts, however, is expected to remain the same at approximately 5 percent of agencies.

Table VI–29 presents the durations of entry-level training provided by the various types of probation and parole agencies. The average duration of training provided to new probation and parole officers is 61 hours. Eighty percent of all agencies providing training offer less than 100 hours; only 24 percent provide more than 80 hours of training. In short, the amount of entry-level training provided in probation

Table VI–29

Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Percent of Agencies Training					Number of Agencies Training	Average Length of Training (in Hours)
		Hours of Training					
	Total	1–40	41–80	81–99	100 or More		
All agencies	100.0	55.5	20.4	4.1	20.1	855	61.2
All probation agencies	100.0	59.0	19.8	2.9	18.3	349	60.8
All parole agencies	100.0	59.5	14.6	4.9	21.0	89	59.8
All combined probation/parole agencies	100.0	49.9	22.5	5.1	22.5	382	63.6
Adult probation	100.0	56.9	29.2	1.6	12.3	72	57.3
Juvenile probation	100.0	56.5	15.6	4.0	23.9	154	65.8
Adult and juvenile probation	100.0	63.5	19.5	2.2	14.8	123	56.4
Adult parole	100.0	34.4	18.8	10.7	36.1	32	77.6
Juvenile parole	100.0	75.1	6.3	2.8	15.8	33	56.2
Adult and juvenile parole	100.0	75.0	20.8	0.0	4.2	24	41.0
Adult probation and parole	100.0	46.2	24.1	6.0	23.7	212	65.5
Juvenile probation and parole	100.0	56.7	17.7	4.4	21.2	113	59.4
Adult and juvenile probation and parole	100.0	25.7	13.3	1.6	59.4	57	64.6
Other agencies	100.0	68.5	17.1	3.3	11.1	35	43.8

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

and parole seldom exceeds 2 weeks, and only about 20 percent of all agencies exceed the National Advisory Commission's standard of 100 hours of entry-level training.

There is relatively little variation in the amount of training provided among probation agencies, parole agencies, and combined probation and parole agencies when examined in the aggregate. Although combined agencies provide slightly more training on the average than either probation or parole agencies, the difference is not large enough to suggest clear superiority.

Probation agencies. In the area of probation there are significant differences between agencies providing services to adult offenders and agencies providing services to juvenile offenders. Juvenile agencies appear to provide significantly more training at entry level than agencies providing services to adult offenders. This pattern is similar to that noted with respect to the overall provision of training: juvenile agencies are more likely to provide training than adult agencies. However, unlike the pattern found with regard to the provision of training, the amount of training provided in agencies serving both adult and juvenile offenders is approximately the same as that provided by agencies serving adults only. In this instance, the consolidation of services does not appear to result in more training.

Parole agencies. A broader variation in the duration of training provided by parole agencies is found when the class of offender served is controlled. Adult agencies appear to provide significantly more entry-level training than either juvenile parole agencies or combined adult and juvenile agencies. Indeed, it appears that adult parole agencies provide more training on the average than any other type of agency.

Juvenile parole agencies provide slightly less than the average duration of training among all agencies, and significantly less than the amount provided in adult parole. This latter superiority of adult agencies is similar to that found with respect to the overall provision of training. However, both adult and juvenile agencies are superior to parole agencies serving both adult and juvenile offenders. These combined agencies provide less training at entry than any other type of probation or parole agency.

Consolidated probation and parole agencies. Consolidated agencies are more likely to provide training than agencies providing only probation or parole services exclusively. However, with respect to the duration of training provided, these agencies are only marginally superior. Controlling for the class of offender served, there is little variation in the average length of training provided. Juvenile agencies providing both probation and parole services provide slightly less training than either adult consolidated agencies or consolidated agencies serving both classes of offenders.

E. Assessment of the Length of Entry-Level Training

The amount of training provided in probation and parole agencies for newly employed officers is generally below the standards set by the National Advisory Commission. Only 20 percent of all agencies meet or exceed the 100 hours suggested by the Commission and in about 45 percent of the agencies the amount of training does not meet the minimum standard of 40 hours of basic orientation training. Parole agencies and agencies providing both probation and parole services appear to be marginally superior to probation agencies with respect to the standards. However, the degree of superiority is not large, nor does it greatly improve the overall portrait of training in probation and parole.

Among the individual types of agencies adult parole appears to come closest to meeting the standard of 100 hours. However, juvenile parole agencies appear to perform at a significantly poorer level in relation to the standard. Within the area of probation, only juvenile probation appears to have a significant number of agencies meeting or exceeding the standard. The consolidated agencies appear to perform the best in relation to the standard of 100 hours, with the adult and juvenile consolidated agencies having over half of the agencies meeting or exceeding the standard.

However, despite these variations, the overall performance in probation and parole with respect to the length of training provided is sufficiently poor to suggest that there is a need to upgrade the training in this respect.

The current amount of training provided in probation and parole agencies appears to reflect a trend toward increased length of training. Probation and parole executives collectively reported that entry-level training duration had increased in 64 percent of the agencies within the last five years. However, in 33 percent of the agencies the amount of training provided had remained constant during the previous five years. The remaining 3 percent of agencies report an absolute decrease in the amount of training provided. This pattern, therefore, indicates a trend toward increased entry-level training lengths, but one of a lesser magnitude than that found in either adult corrections and juvenile corrections.

The prospects for a future increase in entry-level training appears to be of a lesser magnitude than that reported for the previous five years. Among agencies providing entry-level training, 41 percent indicated that the length of training would increase within the next two years. An equal proportion, however, indicated that there would be little change in the amount of training provided. In comparision with adult and juvenile corrections, these patterns indicate a lesser level of effort to increase entry-level training lengths, both with respect to the immediate past and the immediate future.

1. *Content of training.* In order to assess the content of the training provided to probation and parole officers, it is necessary to examine the various duties performed by persons in those occupations. The duties performed by probation and parole officers appear to be of two types. First, officers may be required to provide or facilitate the provision of services to offender clients. Officers may be responsible for providing these services themselves or they may be responsible for referring the client to external agencies that provide such services. Second, probation and parole officers may be required to provide certain services to the courts, parole bodies, or other criminal justice authorities having an interest or jurisdiction over the offender. Such duties may include pre-sentence or pre-release investigation, the monitoring of offenders activities or release, the enforcement of the conditions of release, and in some instances the initiation of processes to revoke the release of offenders because of violations of those conditions. In some instances probation and parole officers may also be called upon to serve as advocates for offenders in certain decisions regarding sentencing, release from incarceration, or the decision to permit offenders to participate in services such as work or study release programs.

In addition to these primary duties officers may also be required to serve in quasi-managerial roles. The increased utilization of external services has created the need for officers to coordinate and evaluate those agencies providing services to clients. The use of volunteers and paraprofessional aides also entails a certain level of supervisory activity on the part of officers, as has the development of specialist officers and team-oriented supervision techniques. Finally, the normally heavy case-load under which many officers operate requires a considerable level

Chart VI–5

Primary Tasks Performed by Adult Probation and Parole Officers

- Establishes periodic verbal or personal contact schedule . . . and instructs client with respect to required conformity to the conditions of his probation, parole, or incarceration.
- Establishes and maintains case files and evaluates information to determine the client's progress and needs.
- Modified probation, parole, or correctional program in view of client's needs.
- Advises or counsels clients . . . concerning conditions of probation, parole or incarceration, housing, education; community services, and management of personal affairs to establish realistic and socially acceptable behavior patterns.
- Advises and counsels clients family and/or handles complaints on problems in dealing with client.
- Prepares recommendations, reports, and dispositional plans on clients, for courts, parole board, or classification board.

Source: NMS Occupational Analysis (1975).

of managerial expertise in order to properly allocate available time and resources.

The above description of the roles of probation and parole officers provides a general basis with which to assess the content of the training provided. However, a more precise evaluation can be made by examining the relative priorities indicated in the analyses of occupational demands of the probation and parole position. Chart VI–5 presents the findings of that analysis with respect to the tasks most commonly performed by adult and juvenile probation and parole officers. The tasks are ranked according to the proportion of officers indicating that they performed the task and the amount of time they devoted to the task.

The data indicate that there appear to be no major differences between the types of duties performed by adult and juvenile officers and that the overall ranking of tasks between these two occupations is virtually identical. Thus, it is possible to discuss the probation and parole role generically without reference to the class of offender served by the officers.

The tasks performed by probation and parole officers appear to span both of the primary areas discussed previously: tasks related to the provision of services to offender clients and tasks related to the demands of courts and parole bodies. Moreover, these tasks appear to be relatively balanced in terms of priority based upon the proportion of officers and the amount of time devoted to performing the tasks.

Chart VI–6 presents the primary areas of knowledge necessary for the performance of the various tasks performed by probation and parole officers. These areas were derived from an analysis of the responses of probation and parole executives and supervisors with respect to the level of expertise required in several areas of probation and parole practice. The areas listed in Chart VI–6 are those that were thought to require a high level of expertise, and thus do not necessarily encompass all of the areas where special skill or understanding is required.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the level of expertise attained by typical probation and parole officers at the time they began to function in their positions. The difference between the level of expertise required and attained at entry represents an indication of the magnitude of the gap that must be filled through training and on-the-job experience. Although new entrants were found to be deficient in all of the major areas, in certain areas the magnitude of the deficiency was significantly greater than in others. Moreover, many of these areas appear to be

Chart VI–6

Primary Areas of Knowledge Required for Adult Probation Officers

- Requirements for the revocation of probation and parole
- Investigative techniques
- Philosophy, goals, and objectives of the probation and parole agency.
- Laws and rules pertaining to probation and parole
- Ability to communicate with offender
- Observation, evaluation and assessment of offender
- Evaluation of clients' progress
- Probation and parole forms, records and files
- Ability to establish rapport with clients
- Development of probation and parole plans
- Ability to organize factual data
- Preparation of case history
- Community resource development
- Crisis intervention
- Functions of the correctional institution
- Report writing
- Supervisory and management techniques
- Knowledge of theories of personal development
- Knowledge of community assistance programs
- Knowledge of theories of abnormal behavior
- Alcohol and drug programs

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975.

Table VI–30

Level of Emphasis Assigned to Various Entry-Level Training Topics by Probation and Parole Executives, 1975

(Percent of executives responding)

Training Topics	Level of Emphasis				
	Total	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	Number of Executives Responding
Case supervision	100.0	81.1	17.5	1.4	1940
Investigative techniques	100.0	78.1	18.9	3.0	1913
Counseling techniques	100.0	77.3	20.6	2.1	1935
Community resource utilization	100.0	71.0	26.0	3.0	1910
Case report writing	100.0	68.2	29.1	2.7	1942
Crisis intervention	100.0	53.1	35.6	11.3	1854
Juvenile and family law	100.0	51.8	28.6	19.6	1719
Office policies and procedures	100.0	50.3	41.8	8.0	1930
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	100.0	49.3	26.1	24.6	1678
Alcohol and drug programs	100.0	48.7	44.4	6.8	1902
Juvenile aftercare	100.0	41.3	32.4	26.3	1648
Criminal law	100.0	39.9	44.5	15.6	1872
Pre-release planning and counseling	100.0	37.7	46.4	15.9	1792
International counseling	100.0	24.7	56.4	19.0	1845
Race relations	100.0	17.1	45.9	37.0	1822

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

among the most basic with respect to the functions performed in probation and parole.

Those areas found to have a significant deficiency between desired and actual levels of expertise included: knowledge of investigative techniques; knowledge of the requirements for the revocation of probation or parole status, and other laws and rules pertaining to probation and parole; knowledge of the philosophy of the probation and parole agency where employed; knowledge of the various forms, records, and other materials utilized in probation and parole; the ability to develop plans for probationers and parolees; the preparation of case histories; the development of community resources; crisis intervention; and knowledge of the functions of correctional institutions.

Not all of the above topics are most conveniently learned through formalized training, as opposed to normal on-the-job-experience. However, the indication of significant gaps between desired and actual levels of understanding in these areas may suggest that such topics would be given a high priority in training programs.

A second source of understanding with respect to the assessment of the content of probation and parole training can be derived from responses by probation and parole executives on the relative emphasis certain training topics should receive. Respondents were asked to provide this assessment for both entry-level and in-service training. Discussion of the responses made concerning in-service training will be reserved for the general discussion of that topic, and this analysis will be confined to responses concerning entry-level training only.

Table VI–30 presents the distribution of probation and parole executives with respect to the amount of emphasis they assigned to various training topics. The topics are listed in the order that appears to best approximate the priority the executives assigned to the topics collectively. A certain amount of the variation noted in Table VI–30 can be explained on the basis of the differing levels of relevance of certain topics to executives in differing types of agencies. For example, executives of agencies serving only adult offenders would necessarily place lesser emphasis upon those topics specifically related to juve-

Table VI–31

Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Officers Employed in Combined Probation and Parole Agencies

(Percentage of agencies)

Training Topics	Type of Probation and Parole Agency			
	All Combined Probation and Parole Agencies	Adult Combined Agencies	Juvenile Combined Agencies	Adult and Juvenile Combined Agencies
Office policies and procedures	89.1	91.1	81.2	98.4
Case supervisions	88.8	90.9	84.0	93.2
Case report writing	87.6	90.1	82.6	90.5
Investigative techniques	85.9	90.1	76.3	91.8
Community resource utilization	85.2	89.3	81.2	80.2
Counseling techniques	83.8	84.1	88.9	76.4
Alcohol and drug abuse	60.3	69.8	40.2	66.1
Criminal law	57.9	63.4	45.8	63.4
Pre-release planning and counseling	51.4	46.9	54.1	63.4
Crisis intervention	45.1	40.8	52.7	49.1
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	37.7	(3.0)	86.7	67.3
Juvenile and family law	37.4	(5.0)	88.9	54.3
Juvenile aftercare	36.1	(2.6)	80.6	69.8
Vocational counseling	34.6	38.3	26.3	38.8
Race relations	24.9	27.0	19.4	28.4
Number of agencies training	488	267	144	77
Total parole agencies	713	353	222	138

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

nile matters such as juvenile and family law. Similarly, topics such as pre-release counseling and planning would be more highly emphasized in parole agencies than in agencies only providing probation services.

The priorities expressed by executives do not appear to coincide precisely with the priorities suggested by the occupational analysis discussed above. The largest difference is in the apparent level of importance attached to legal topics and to basic office policies and procedures. These areas, where a significant level of deficiency was thought to exist, appear to be assigned a strong emphasis by only approximately 50 percent of the executives. Crisis intervention, an additional area where a deficiency was thought to exist, was assigned strong emphasis by 53 percent of executives.

Apart from these differences, however, executives appear to assign a high priority to most of the major areas where entry-level officers were thought to be deficient. The supervision of cases, investigation, counseling techniques, and community resource utilization are each assigned a high priority by executives, mirroring the need expressed in the occupational analysis in these areas.

Tables VI–31, VI–32, and VI–33 present the extent of coverage of various training topics in probation, parole, and combined probation and parole agencies providing entry-level training. In general there is little variation in the emphasis given to the various training topics between the various types of agencies. Much of the variation that is evident can be explained on the basis of the specialized needs of the type of agency providing the training. For example, topics relating to the handling of juvenile offenders are necessarily given less emphasis in agencies dealing exclusively with adult offenders. Similarly, topics related to the needs of adult offenders such as vocational counseling and alcohol and drug programs are given less emphasis in juvenile agencies. Training topics having an apparent relevance to all types of agencies are covered at a fairly consistent level across all types of agencies.

Apart from these variations certain topics are covered with greater frequency than others; topics relating to office policies and procedures, case supervision, report writing, counseling techniques, investigative techniques, and the utilization of community resources. Covered with a lesser degree of frequency are such topics as legal matters, crisis intervention, and race relations.

a. *Assessment of entry-level training content*. In

Table VI–32

Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Probation Officers, 1975

(Percent of agencies providing entry-level training)

	Type of Probation Agency			
	All Probation Agencies	Adult Probation	Juvenile Probation	Adult and Juvenile Probation
Investigative techniques	91.2	100.0	84.3	91.6
Case report writing	90.8	100.0	87.4	88.4
Case supervision	88.2	100.0	81.0	90.3
Community resource utilization	87.0	90.8	89.1	82.3
Counseling techniques	86.3	88.3	86.4	85.7
Office policies and procedures	85.5	94.3	89.1	72.6
Juvenile and family law	73.5	(16.4)	93.9	81.0
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	70.4	(14.2)	93.9	73.6
Criminal law	63.2	79.1	48.3	61.6
Alcohol and drug programs	61.6	90.8	48.3	61.6
Crisis intervention	48.3	40.0	58.2	40.9
Juvenile aftercare	37.8	(10.7)	47.3	41.4
Vocational counseling	31.9	46.0	27.6	29.5
Pre-release planning and counseling	29.0	31.8	26.2	30.8
Race relations	20.2	30.6	20.1	14.6
Number of agencies training	418	85	184	149
Total probation agencies	880	211	385	284

Source: NMS Executives Surveys, 1975.

Table VI–33

Training Topics Covered in Entry-Level Training for New Parole Officers, 1975

(Percent of agencies providing entry level-training)

	Type of Parole Agency:			
Training Topic	All Parole Agencies	Adult Parole	Juvenile Parole	Adult and Juvenile Parole
Office policies and procedures	87.3	77.2	91.6	96.0
Case supervision	84.7	75.2	89.3	92.4
Case report writing	81.5	75.2	82.6	88.9
Community resource utilization	79.9	73.2	84.8	81.8
Counseling techniques	75.7	73.2	78.2	74.6
Investigative techniques	58.4	52.8	60.2	64.0
Pre-release planning and counseling	57.6	48.8	64.7	60.4
Alcohol and drug programs	53.5	65.0	35.6	60.4
Criminal law	49.3	61.0	37.9	46.2
Crisis intervention	44.4	44.8	40.2	49.8
Juvenile aftercare	41.9	(4.0)	89.3	32.0
Juvenile and family law	37.9	(6.1)	73.7	35.6
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	32.9	(4.0)	67.0	28.4
Vocational counseling	32.9	36.6	31.3	28.4
Race relations	27.1	40.6	13.3	24.8
Number of agencies training	122	49	45	28
Total parole agencies	180	60	84	26

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

general the coverage of training topics in probation and parole appears to mirror the priorities of probation and parole executives. Certain variations may be noted, however. More emphasis is placed upon operational procedures in training than is recommended by the executives collectively. Executives rank the importance of crisis intervention skills more highly than is reflected in the proportion of agencies providing training in that topic. In most other respects, however, the priorities expressed by probation and parole executives appear to parallel the actual content of the training provided at entry.

In most instances, the items most frequently offered in entry training are among those identified by the NMS occupational analysis as requiring the highest level of expertise. These areas are, specifically, investigative techniques, knowledge of forms and records, the development of plans for clients, the preparation of case histories, and the development of community resources. These areas appear to be covered in entry-level training with relative frequency. However, the areas of legal requirements and crisis intervention appear to be neglected in entry-level training. The latter area, also cited by executives as a major area of training, is covered by only about half of all agencies during entry-level training. Similarly, legal topics, here represented by the topics of criminal law and juvenile and family law, are not as often covered as would be expected from the occupational analysis.

Training in legal topics requires some clarification. It should be noted first that the coverage of juvenile and family law in training provided in juvenile agencies is relatively high. However, the coverage of criminal law in adult agencies ranges from 79 percent in probation agencies to 61 percent in parole agencies. Although some caution is in order, considering the limitations of the available data, the general impression gained is that legal topics are not as heavily emphasized in adult probation and parole agencies as they should be considering the importance of the subject.

2. *In-service training.* Approximately 72 percent of all probation and parole agencies provided some form of in-service training to their personnel in 1975. In 22 percent of all agencies, in-service training was the only form of training provided. In approximately 50 percent of all agencies, in-service training supplemented an entry-level training program. As in juvenile corrections, in-service training was the principal form of training provided in probation and parole; a significantly larger proportion of agencies provide such training than provide instruction at entry. Thus, in-service training cannot be assessed purely as a device to upgrade existing staff, for in a large proportion of the agencies, it is a delayed form of orientation training as well.

As column (7) of Table VI–34 indicates, among agencies providing in-service training, the proportion of officers receiving such training during the course

Table VI–34

Proportions of Probation and Parole Officers Provided In-Service Training, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies	Distribution of Agencies by Percentage of Officers Trained					Mean Percentage of Officers Trained
		Total	1–10 Percent	11–50 Percent	51–90 Prcent	91–100 Percent	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
All agencies	1,225	100.0	7.5	15.4	18.1	58.9	74.9
All probation agencies	529	100.0	6.8	16.6	18.3	58.2	75.0
All parole agencies	128	100.0	7.0	14.8	20.3	57.8	75.1
All combined agencies	513	100.0	8.2	14.4	17.2	60.2	75.1
Adult probation	114	100.0	4.3	12.2	17.5	65.8	80.0
Juvenile probation	241	100.0	7.1	13.7	17.0	62.2	77.0
Adult and juvenile probation	174	100.0	8.0	23.6	20.6	47.7	69.1
Adult parole	42	100.0	4.8	23.8	16.7	54.8	71.5
Juvenile parole	55	100.0	10.9	9.0	23.6	56.4	75.1
Adult, juvenile parole	31	100.0	3.2	12.9	19.3	64.5	80.0
Adult probation and parole	272	100.0	7.0	14.4	16.2	62.5	76.4
Juvenile probation and parole	153	100.0	9.2	13.8	17.0	62.1	76.3
Adult and juvenile probation and parole	88	100.0	10.2	19.4	20.5	50.0	69.1
Other	55	100.0	9.1	18.1	18.1	54.5	70.8

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Table VI–35

Average Duration of In-Service Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Distribution of Agencies by Hours of Training					Number of Agencies Training	Average Duration of Training (in Hours)
	Total	1–39	40–79	80–99	100 or More		
All agencies	100.0	59.0	31.2	4.5	5.3	1,319	38.2
All probation agencies	100.0	64.7	26.1	3.4	5.7	524	36.9
All parole agencies	100.0	58.6	29.7	4.7	7.0	128	42.6
All combined agencies	100.0	51.4	38.2	5.4	5.0	616	40.4
Adult probation	100.0	70.8	22.1	3.5	3.5	113	32.6
Juvenile probation	100.0	63.7	26.6	3.4	6.3	237	37.7
Adult and juvenile probation	100.0	62.1	28.2	3.4	6.3	174	38.4
Adult parole	100.0	62.5	27.5	5.0	5.0	40	53.6
Juvenile parole	100.0	54.5	30.9	5.5	9.1	55	38.5
Adult and juvenile parole	100.0	60.6	30.3	3.0	6.1	33	36.1
Adult probation and parole	100.0	47.8	41.5	5.9	4.8	270	39.5
Juvenile probation and parole	100.0	48.1	39.7	6.4	5.8	156	46.5
Adult and juvenile probation and parole	100.0	67.8	25.6	2.2	4.4	90	32.5
Other	100.0	65.6	26.5	4.6	3.3	151	31.4

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

of a year is extremely high, particularly in comparison with adult correctional agencies. On the average, approximately 75 percent of all incumbent officers receive in-service training per year. This proportion is virtually the same for all types of probation and parole agencies. No type of agency providing in-service training offers it, on average, to less than 69 percent of its officers, and no type offers it to more than 80 percent. The figure is approximately the same as the proportion of juvenile child care workers who receive in-service training.

The distribution of agencies with respect to the proportion of officers receiving in-service training is also similar to that found in juvenile corrections. Table VI–34 shows that 59 percent of all agencies offering in-service training provide it to more than 90 percent of their officers; only 23 percent of all agencies train 50 percent or less during the course of a year.

Thus, although some growth in this form of training is likely, the prospect is that a considerable proportion of agencies will continue to offer no training in the immediate future.

a. *Location of in-service training.* In-service training is most often conducted at the agency where the officers being trained are employed. Forty-two percent of agencies providing in-service training do so at this location. However, considerably more variation in the location of in-service training exists than is the case with entry training. Educational institutions are utilized for in-service training by 36 percent of the agencies. This is the most extensive use of this resource among the various types of correctional agencies examined. In addition, 32 percent of the agencies report that in-service training is provided at state probation and parole offices. Caution should be exercised here, however, in that it is likely that this percentage represents state parole or other state-level agencies having more direct access to state facilities. Finally, 8 percent of the agencies report that in-service training is provided by the local courts.

b. *Duration of in-service training.* The average duration of in-service training provided for probation and parole officers was 38 hours in 1975. This was considerably less than the amount provided to new probation and parole officers at entry. However, it is comparable to the amount of training provided in juvenile corrections agencies, which averaged 34 hours of in-service training each year.

Table VI–35 presents the distribution of agencies with respect to the duration of training provided. The table shows considerable variation among types of agencies. In general, parole agencies and consolidated probation and parole agencies provide longer training on the average than probation agencies. However, in all cases the majority of agencies provide less than 40 hours of training, and only a small proportion provide 80 or more hours of in-service training. Moreover, the differences between the types of agencies appear to be relatively insignificant beyond the 80-hour level.

Comparing the performance of probation and parole agencies with the standard suggested by the National Advisory Commission, it is apparent that only 40 percent of the agencies meet or exceed the standard of 40 hours per year. Although the level of effort is superior to that found with respect to entry-level training, a considerable increase in training would be required to bring all agencies up to the standard. This is further emphasized by the heavy reliance placed upon in-service training in probation and parole within those agencies that provide only in-service training.

c. *Content of in-service training*. The lesser amount of time devoted to in-service training is reflected in the extent of coverage provided various training topics by probation and parole agencies. In general, the proportion of agencies covering any given topic in in-service training is smaller than the proportion that trained that topic at entry level. This finding, despite the fact that a larger proportion of agencies provide in-service than entry-level training, may be interpreted in two ways. First, it may be that there is less uniformity in the coverage of topics in in-service training. If each agency selects different topics to be covered, fewer topics would be trained universally than is the case with entry-level programs. Second, this finding may imply simply that fewer topics are covered in in-service training. Given the lesser amount of time devoted to in-service training it is reasonable to suppose that fewer topics would be covered.

A second difference between the content of entry- and in-service training appears in the overall ranking of topics. Unlike the content of training in adult and juvenile corrections, there are marked differences in the general coverage of certain topics. These differences are best presented by considering each of the various topics of probation and parole agencies.

Probation agencies. Among agencies providing only probation services, the topics most frequently covered in each type of training are as follows, in order of priority:

ENTRY-LEVEL TRAINING

- investigative techniques
- case report writing
- case supervision
- community resource utilization
- counseling techniques
- office policies and procedures

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

- counseling techniques
- community resource utilization
- case supervision
- alcohol and drug programs
- investigative techniques
- juvenile and family law

The entry-level training topics are covered by 85 percent or more of all agencies that provide entry training, while the in-service topics are covered by 58 percent or more of agencies that provide such training (see Table VI-36). Although many of the topics are the same, the orders of priority suggest that entry-level training is more heavily oriented towards administrative- and procedural matters, while in-service training is more heavily oriented toward the provision of services to offender clients.

Parole agencies. A similar pattern may be noted with respect to the content of entry and in-service training in agencies providing only parole services (see Table VI-37). Topics covered in entry-level training by 75 percent or more of all agencies and by 54 percent or more of agencies providing in-service training include, in order of coverage:

Table VI-36

Percentages of Probation Agencies Providing In-Service Training in Selected Topics, 1975

Training Topic	All Agencies	Type of Agency		
		Adult	Juvenile	Adult and Juvenile
Counseling techniques	81.6	82.1	83.6	78.8
Community resource utilization	72.3	71.1	70.5	70.0
Case supervision	68.7	66.8	62.1	78.4
Alcohol and drug programs	68.7	82.1	63.8	66.9
Investigative techniques	60.0	70.2	50.8	78.4
Juvenile and family law	58.3	n/a	75.9	47.6
Case report writing	56.2	65.2	44.5	66.4
Criminal law	52.3	68.6	41.7	56.6
Crisis intervention	52.2	40.5	61.4	47.1
Office policies and procedures	50.8	56.8	46.4	52.9
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	43.1	n/a	52.3	53.5
Vocational counseling	31.9	38.9	26.8	34.2
Pre-release planning and counseling	27.4	22.0	29.1	28.6
Race relations	19.3	21.1	18.5	19.1
Juvenile aftercare	19.0	n/a	38.6	32.1
Number of agencies providing in-service training	565	118	254	193

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Table VI-37

Percentages of Parole Agencies Providing In-Service Training in Selected Topics, 1975

(Percent of agencies providing training)

Training Topic	All Agencies	Type of Agency		
		Adult	Juvenile	Adult and Juvenile
Counseling techniques	76.7	72.9	86.0	65.9
Case supervision	64.1	58.4	72.5	57.4
Community resource utilization	61.1	54.1	65.7	79.7
Case report writing	60.5	45.9	47.2	77.4
Alcohol and drug programs	57.7	58.4	47.2	74.5
Crisis intervention	54.8	37.5	55.7	77.4
Office policies and procedures	46.5	43.8	43.9	54.5
Criminal law	41.5	47.9	23.7	63.1
Investigative techniques	38.7	35.4	30.3	57.4
Juvenile and family law	35.2	n/a	57.4	40.1
Pre-release planning and counseling	34.4	33.4	38.8	28.7
Vocational counseling	30.9	35.4	25.4	34.4
Race relations	30.9	35.4	25.4	34.4
Juvenile aftercare	30.3	n/a	57.4	20.0
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	21.8	n/a	35.4	22.9
Number' of agencies providing in-service training	142	48	59	35

Source: NMS Executive Surveys (1975).

ENTRY-LEVEL TRAINING

- office policies and procedures
- case supervision
- case report writing
- community resource utilization
- counseling techniques

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

- counseling techniques
- case supervision
- community resource utilization
- case report writing
- alcohol and drug programs

Again, although the topics are nearly identical, they suggest a heavier concentration upon direct service topics in in-service training than in entry-level training.

d. *Consolidated probation and parole agencies.* An almost identical pattern can be noted by comparing the content emphasis in entry-level and in-service training in agencies providing both probation and parole services (see Table VI–38). Again, although the principal topics are almost the same, the orderings of the topics suggest greater emphasis upon client-oriented topics.

Table VI–38

Training Topics Covered in In-Service Training for Officers of Consolidated Probation/Parole Agencies, 1975

Training Topic	All Probation/ Parole Agencies	Type of Probation/Parole Agency		
		Adult Probation/ Parole	Juvenile Probation/ Parole	Adult and Juvenile Probation/ Parole
Counseling techniques	80.3	81.5	82.7	73.7
Alcohol and drug programs	68.1	78.3	52.7	65.2
Case supervision	67.5	71.4	61.6	67.0
Community resource utilization	65.4	68.7	62.0	62.3
Investigative techniques	53.8	61.4	44.5	48.2
Case report writing	51.3	57.2	40.5	52.9
Office policies and procedures	51.2	61.4	38.2	44.5
Criminal law	46.0	50.4	35.8	51.0
Crisis intervention	44.2	39.3	53.9	41.6
Pre-release planning and counseling	34.3	32.0	36.3	37.8
Juvenile and family law	32.5	n/a	76.8	44.5
Vocational counseling	29.4	38.6	15.2	24.5
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	27.5	n/a	64.5	37.8
Juvenile aftercare	25.0	n/a	56.9	40.7
Race relations	22.3	23.8	17.1	29.3
Number of agencies providing in-service training	566	290	170	105

Source: NMS Executive Surveys (1975).

e. *Assessment of the content of in-service training.* As in entry-level training, the content of in-service training may be assessed on the two bases of the opinions expressed by probation and parole executives concerning the levels of emphasis to be assigned to the various training topics, and the findings of the NMS occupational analysis of the probation and parole officer position.

Table VI–39 presents the responses of probation and parole executives regarding 15 in-service training topics. Certain differences can be immediately noted between this table and the parallel table for entry-

Table VI–39

Levels of Emphasis Assigned to Various In-Service Training Topics by Probation and Parole Executives, 1975

(Percentage of executives responding)

Training Topics	Level of Emphasis				
	Total	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Little Emphasis	Number of Executives Responding
Counseling techniques	100.0	78.1	19.6	2.3	1912
Case supervision	100.0	77.4	20.7	1.8	1900
Community resource utilization	100.0	69.9	25.7	4.4	1866
Investigative techniques	100.0	65.9	29.1	4.9	1879
Case report writing	100.0	57.2	35.6	7.2	1898
Crisis intervention	100.0	56.2	32.4	11.4	1816
Alcohol and drug programs	100.0	52.7	41.1	6.2	1860
Juveniles and family law	100.0	51.7	28.2	20.2	1666
Juvenile intake policies and procedures	100.0	46.3	27.8	25.9	1621
Criminal law	100.0	41.7	42.1	16.2	1824
Office policies and procedures	100.0	41.0	42.2	16.9	1875
Juvenile aftercare	100.0	40.7	31.4	27.9	1596
Pre-release planning and counseling	100.0	36.1	46.9	16.9	1766
Vocational counseling	100.0	28.9	54.6	16.9	1824
Race relations	100.0	17.6	45.6	36.8	1765

Source: NMS Executive Surveys (1975).

level training. First, there is an apparent decrease in the level of consensus concerning the importance of the various topics. There are far fewer topics to which executives overwhelmingly assign a high level of emphasis in in-service training than in entry-level training. Second, the order of the topics is significantly different from that noted in entry-level training.

The occupational analysis findings, when applied against the patterns noted above, suggest two conclusions. First, in agencies providing both entry and in-service training, presuming that the patterns of coverage already discussed are typical of the coverage provided in these agencies, there appears to be a relatively complementary coverage of the primary areas of responsibility. Certain areas, primarily legal topics, are relatively neglected in both forms of training, but in most other areas the training appears to coincide with the demands of the probation and parole officer position.

The second conclusion, however, is less sanguine. Among agencies providing only in-service training, there appears to be a marked neglect of certain topics, related to official policy, investigative techniques, and legal topics, each of which were found to require remedial training for newly-employed officers. In short, the provision of in-service training for this group of agencies appears to be relatively inadequate.

3. *Summary and conclusions.* In general, the status of training in probation and parole is similar to that in juvenile corrections. That is, although a majority of agencies provide some form of training to either their new or incumbent personnel, there are very clear areas of deficiency in both the quality and quantity of the training provided.

- Approximately 20 percent of all agencies provide no training whatsoever.
- Only half of all agencies provide both entry and in-service training.
- The amount of training provided both entry and in-service is significantly below the proposed national standards in the majority of agencies.
- The most apparent factor explaining the level of training provided is centralization. That is, parole agencies and consolidated agencies are more likely to train than locally-based probation agencies.
- The content of the training appears to coincide with the primary requirements of the position but more closely reflects the priorities of executives.
- Certain areas, primarily legal requirements, are neglected during training.
- A major problem is the large number of agencies providing only in-service training where, given the low overall duration of training and the restricted coverage of topics, there appears to be a lack of adequate topical coverage.
- The prospects for future improvement in the quality and quantity of training appear to be moderately favorable, although less favorable than in other areas of corrections.

In summary, probation and parole appears to offer a primary target for efforts to upgrade training in corrections, particularly in the area of probation. Although a certain amount of training might be foregone because of the overall higher educational attainment of probation and parole officers, there remains a need to establish some special instruction in certain areas not customarily covered in educational programs.

F. Supervisory Training in Corrections (See Volume V for training of executives)

The position of the supervisor in corrections, as in most large-scale organizations, includes a combination of duties overlapping both management and operational functions. Not only must the supervisor translate the policies formulated by management-level personnel into concrete procedures, but in many cases the supervisor must also serve as the advocate of line personnel before management. In an ideal sense the supervisor should possess a mastery of the functions performed by line personnel in addition to a grasp of the larger policy-level concepts that guide the actions of the operational level.

Chart VI–7 presents those tasks performed by supervisors in corrections in addition to regular line functions. The tasks are listed according to the amount of time incumbent supervisors reported devoting to the various tasks.

According to Chart VI–7 the tasks of a supervisor involve interaction with both line and management persons as well as direct contact with the persons under the custody of the agency. The latter contact, however, is primarily made in order to elicit information rather than as a personal or a security-related matter. In each case the task appears to revolve around the collection, organization, and transmission of information in one form or another.

Chart VI–8 presents the principal areas of skill and knowledge required of correctional supervisors, based upon the responses of incumbent supervisors and correctional executives. The areas are listed in the order best describing the general level of expertise required of supervisors in each of the areas. The listing suggests that the most important areas of knowledge pertain to direct interactions with personnel being supervised, to effectively organize, train and motivate these personnel.

Incumbent officers and corrections executives were asked to indicate the tasks for which supervisors were inadequately trained, and the areas of skill and knowledge where there was a significant "gap" between desired and actual levels of expertise. The areas apparently requiring additional training include the preparation of reports; the training of personnel; the organization, assignment, and monitoring of the work of subordinates; and the completion of routine personnel work such as performance evaluation.

The centrality of these tasks to the role of the supervisor suggests the need to provide training for persons entering the position. Supervisors were asked where they learned to perform the various tasks required of them. The consistent response was that the tasks were learned primarily through on-the-job experience rather than through formal training or education. Inasmuch as these tasks are not normally performed by line personnel it may be presumed that persons entering a supervisory position are not adequately prepared to perform these duties for a significant period of time after actually beginning the job.

The personnel practices in corrections also provide additional justifications for supervisory training. It was suggested that the relative scarcity of promo-

Chart VI–7

Principal Tasks Performed by Supervisors in Corrections

- Talking with and listening to inmate and staff, concerning decisions regarding custody, discipline, treatment, or parole.
- Completes oral or written reports and other routine administrative duties in order to provide inputs regarding institutional needs.
- Schedules, assigns, and monitors personnel under his or her supervision to assure the safety and security of the institution.
- Conducts formal and informal training of personnel.
- Accepts custody of suspects or offender in order to develop the formal record of the agency.
- Conducts and attends meetings of key personnel to give and receive information.

Source: See Volume VIII.

Chart VI–8

Principal Areas of Skill and Knowledge Required of Correctional Supervisors

- Ability to organize and staff crews and work shifts.
- Knowledge of on-the-job training techniques and procedures.
- The ability to motivate persons under supervision.
- The ability to complete administrative reports.
- Knowledge and ability to complete routine personnel actions.

Source: NMS Field Occupational Analysis Studies, 1975.

Table VI–40

Proportion of Corrections Agencies Requiring Supervisory Training of Newly Appointed Supervisory Personnel, by Type of Corrections Agency, 1975

Type of Corrections Agency	Percent Requiring Training	Number of Agencies
Adult corrections	8.3	220
Juvenile corrections	12.6	585
Probation and parole	12.5	2,011

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

tional opportunities in corrections tends to discourage line personnel from developing those skills that might be useful to a supervisor. Rigid and mechanical merit system processes thus serve to restrict inherent learning on-the-job and to create a need to develop these skills in training.

Correctional executives generally support the need for supervisory training. However, the actual performance of the agencies in this regard is very poor. Table VI–40 presents the distribution of correctional agencies with respect to the provision of supervisory training. The table clearly indicates that only a small proportion of correctional agencies provide supervisory training. A more detailed evaluation of this data indicates no significant variations from the norm. Thus, despite clear indication of need, this area of corrections training requires considerable remedial support.

G. Training for Correctional Treatment and Educational Personnel

The role of the treatment and educational personnel in adult and juvenile corrections has come under increased scrutiny in recent years. To the long-standing criticism that correctional agencies are not effectively rehabilitating the persons placed in their custody has been added further speculation that the entire venture or rehabilitation may be inherently impracticable as well as intrinsically unjust. Despite these criticisms it appears likely that correctional agencies will continue to employ persons with various skills and backgrounds in order to provide a variety of social and educational services to their residents. Even proposals for the establishment of what is called "humane incarceration" require the provision of basic services necessary for the essential functioning of institutions; and as one specialist in corrections has suggested, it seems unlikely that the long American tradition of rehabilitation will be entirely abandoned in the immediate future.

Training in corrections for treatment personnel can only be assessed in very general terms. Given the broad variety of professions employed in so-called treatment roles—professions including psychologists, psychiatrists, educators, social workers, vocational teachers, and counselors—it is impossible here to evaluate the training needs of each. In the past the criticism has been raised that treatment and educational specialists in corrections, despite educational preparation, are not adequately prepared to face the demands of the correctional setting. Thus, as an indication of the present effort to assist such persons to adapt to the peculiar demands of a correctional institution, this assessment will focus upon the efforts to provide training at the entry level.

In 1975 approximately 76 percent of adult corrections agencies provided initial training to newly employed treatment and educational personnel. This is considerably less than the current effort to provide entry-level training to line correctional officers, that being an almost universal practice in adult corrections. However, by contrast, in juvenile agencies in 1975, where the overall ratio of treatment and education specialists is much higher than in adult corrections, the proportion of agencies providing initial training to these personnel was approximately 52 percent.

Tables VI–41 and VI–42 present the distribution of adult and juvenile corrections with respect to the training of treatment and educational personnel. Table VI–41, dealing with adult corrections agencies, indicates clearly that the likelihood that training will be provided to these personnel is a function of the size of the agency. Smaller agencies are less likely than larger agencies to provide training. Table VI–42 also indicates a significant variation in the provision of training by type of juvenile corrections agency. Although the overall pattern is not indicative of broad variations, it is clear that juvenile detention and half-way houses are less likely to train new treatment personnel than training schools and ranch, camp, or farm facilities. The constant factor here appears to be the fact that in the former facilities the period of time a juvenile is held is generally shorter than in the other two facilities. This may suggest that treatment functions are less crucial to the temporary facilities, thus reducing the apparent need to train. In the halfway houses and group homes, which are more heavily oriented toward rehabilitative processes, the neglect of training may be raised as a

Table VI–41

Percentage of Adult Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training to New Treatment and Educational Personnel, by Size of Agency

Numbe of Employees	Percentage of agencies Training	Total Number of Agencies
All agencies	75.9	203
1–24	68.8	16
25–74	68.3	41
75–149	78.4	37
150–399	75.0	68
400 or more	85.4	41

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Table VI–42

Percentage of Juvenile Corrections Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training for Treatment and Educational Staff, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Percentage of Agencies Training	Total Number of Agencies
All agencies	45.1	193
Juvenile detention center	60.2	118
Training school	61.5	65
Ranch, camp, or farm	43.1	86
Halfway house/group home	64.6	31
Other	51.7	493

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

significant area of deficiency. The problem here, however, may be the relatively small size of such facilities, making regularized training difficult to sustain.

Tables VI–43 and VI–44 present the distribution of adult and juvenile agencies with respect to the length of training provided to new treatment and educational personnel. The average length of training provided to adult treatment and educational personnel in 1975 was approximately 71 hours. This is considerably less than the average amount of training provided at entry to new correctional officers. It is, however, comparable to the amount of in-service training provided to officers in 1975. In general, the smaller agencies tended to provide less training at entry than the medium sized or larger agencies.

Table VI–44 indicates that the length of training provided to treatment personnel in juvenile corrections agencies averaged 31 hours, far less than in adult agencies. Juvenile detention facilities and juvenile halfway houses tend to provide less training than either the training schools or the ranch, camp, and farm facilities.

Applying the National Advisory Commission standard of 100 hours of entry-level training, it can be generally stated that in both adult and juvenile corrections the number of agencies meeting or exceeding the standard is extremely small. Based upon this it may be suggested that a major training deficiency exists in corrections, particularly juvenile corrections, with respect to the preparation of new treatment and educational personnel. To the extent that treatment programs may be otherwise criticized, it appears that the effort to alleviate these deficiencies through training is not being widely undertaken.

Table VI–43

Length of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Treatment and Educational Personnel in Adult Corrections, by Size of Agency, 1975

(Percentage of agencies training)

Number of Employees	Hours of Training						
	Total	1–16	17–40	41–100	101 or more	Number of Agencies	Average Length (In Hours)
All agencies	100.0	10.4	42.2	18.8	28.4	154	70.9
1–24	100.0	9.1	54.5	18.2	18.2	11	52.9
25–74	100.0	3.6	53.6	21.4	21.4	28	63.6
75–149	100.0	13.8	34.5	13.8	37.9	29	77.5
150–399	100.0	11.8	35.3	23.5	29.4	51	75.8
400 or more	100.0	11.4	45.7	14.3	28.6	35	69.9

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Table VI-44

Length of Entry-Level Training Provided to New Treatment and Educational Personnel in Juvenile Corrections, by Type of Agency, 1975

(Percentage of agencies)

Type of Agency	Hours of Training						
	Total	1-16	17-40	41-80	81 or More	Number of Agencies	Average Length (In Hours)
All agencies	100.0	37.2	44.3	13.3	5.2	255	30.9
Juvenile detention center	100.0	44.8	47.1	8.0	0.0	87	22.7
Training school	100.0	28.2	40.8	21.2	9.8	71	39.1
Ranch, camp, or farm	100.0	22.7	60.0	12.8	0.5	40	36.8
Halfway house/group home	100.0	45.9	40.5	8.1	5.5	37	26.5
Other	100.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	20	34.3

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

H. Major Findings and Conclusions in Correctional Training

Six areas were considered in evaluating the training in corrections: the proportion of agencies providing training, the proportion of personnel receiving training, the location of the training, the duration of the training, the content of the training, and the future prospects of the training.

1. *Adult corrections.*

- Provision of training in adult corrections is fairly extensive. Only 3 percent provide no entry-level training and only 15 percent provide no in-service training. The very smallest agencies tend to be the most deficient, but the variation by size is not very large.
- Although almost every agency requires entry-level training of all new officers, fewer than 10 percent of all officers probably receive in-service training each year.
- The location of training is still the individual agency in a majority of the agencies although there is a growing trend toward centralized facilities. Very limited use is made of local educational facilities.
- The length of training is the most variable factor found in training. The average length of entry training is 107 hours and the average length of in-service training is 62 hours. Yet only about half the agencies meet or exceed the NAC standards of 100 hours at entry and 40 hours in-service. Size is again a factor, with the smaller and larger agencies tending to provide less training than agencies with 75–400 employees.
- The content of the training is the most difficult area to assess; however, the pattern is toward much greater emphasis on custodial and security functions than upon treatment/human relations training. AIR's analysis pointed to the latter as being a significant area of responsibility, not so much in terms of the rehabilitation of inmates as the need to have officers who can understand and interact with inmates in order to maintain the order and civility of the institution. The training coverage otherwise conforms to assessed occupational needs and closely parallels the opinions of correctional executives regarding desired levels of emphasis.

2. *Juvenile corrections.*

- Juvenile corrections is by far the most deficient of the three correctional areas, in terms of provision of training. Twenty-eight percent of the agencies provide no training, 21 percent provide only in-service training and only 43 percent provide both entry and in-service training. Smaller and less secure facilities appear to be the most deficient in providing training.
- Almost all agencies providing entry training required it of all new employees and the average proportion receiving in-service training was 72 percent.
- The location of the training was, as in adult corrections, most often the employing agency itself although there was a growing trend toward centralized facilities, and greater use was being

made of educational facilities. This latter trend is more pronounced in in-service training than in entry-level training.

- The duration of the training was the lowest of the three sectors of corrections. The average length of entry and in-service training was 30 and 34 hours, respectively. There was the expected relationship between size and length of training, and again, smaller and less secure facilities performed the poorest.
- The content of the training varies between entry level and in-service courses and by facility type. The pattern is that of greater emphasis on policies, procedures, and custodial functions during entry level training, and greater emphasis upon counseling and psychology in in-service training. NMS staff concluded, based on occupational analysis, that there was a need for a better balance of training between custody and human relations skills.

3. *Probation and parole.*

- The provision of training in probation and parole is slightly better than in juvenile corrections. Approximately 20 percent of agencies provide no training, 22 percent provide only in-service training, and approximately 50 percent of agencies provide both entry and in-service training.
- The proportion of personnel receiving training is similar to that found in juvenile corrections. Virtually all agencies require entry-level training of new officers and an average of 75 percent of incumbent officers are provided with entry-level training each year.
- The location of the training, as in the other two sectors, is primarily the employing facility itself although a sizable proportion, presumably state parole personnel, utilize state level facilities. In-service training sites are more varied than entry-level training sites with greater use of educational facilities (30 percent) than in any other area of corrections. The trend is away from purely in-house training and toward centralized facilities and educational facilities as locations for training.
- The length of the training varies greatly between entry and in-service training. The average length of entry-level training is 61 hours and the average length of in-service training is 38 hours. Adult parole and juvenile probation provide the greatest amount of training, both entry and in-service, but less than half the agencies meet or exceed the NAC standards for either entry or in-service training.
- The content of the training varies between entry and in-service. Apart from variations resulting from specialized areas of interest (i.e., juvenile and family law) the entry-level training appears to emphasize agency policies and the duties provided to courts and/or parole boards. In-service training appears to emphasize services to offender clients. The AIR analysis identified training needs in the direct service area and in legal areas that do not appear to be covered in many of the programs.

4. *Correctional supervisors.*

- The amount of training provided to correctional supervisors is considerably less than would be anticipated given the consensus of correctional executives that such training is necessary and desirable. The analysis of occupational demands also suggests a need for such training. However, less than 15 percent of all correctional agencies require such training as a matter of policy, and in the case of adult corrections the proportion is less than 10 percent.

5. *Correctional treatment and educational personnel.*

- Approximately 76 percent of adult agencies provide entry-level training to treatment and educational personnel compared with 45 percent of juvenile agencies providing such training. The average length of this training is 71 hours in adult corrections and 31 hours in juvenile corrections.
- In adult corrections the provision of training to treatment and educational personnel varies by size, larger agencies tending to provide training more often than smaller agencies. No clear pattern was found in juvenile corrections.

6. *General findings.* The overall portrait of training for line personnel in corrections is one of considerable improvement over previously reported levels, but with significant areas of deficiency remaining. Adult corrections appears to be the most advanced in terms of training along a variety of criteria, followed, at a distance, by probation and parole and juvenile corrections in that order. A clear indication is that size and centralized organization enhance the ability of agencies to train. Not the least of the benefits derived from a centralized organization is the ability to develop and enforce uniform standards in training.

Chart VI-9

Future Skill and Knowledge Expanded Requirements for Correctional Personnel

COUNSELOR, ADULT INSTITUTION

- Crisis Intervention
- Interpersonal Relationship Skills
- Communication Skills
- Ethnic Customs
- Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
- Observing, Evaluating and Assessing Human Behavior
- Intensive Casework with Hard Core

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER, ADULT INSTITUTION

- Team Counseling
- Supervision of Inmates
- Work and Treatment Program Development
- Staff-Inmate Interactions
- Specialist Positions within New Civil Service Specifications

COUNSELOR, COMMUNITY-BASED

- Community Resource Development
- Working with and Training Volunteers
- Team Work with Other Professionals

ADULT, COMMUNITY-BASED, ADMINISTRATION

- Planning and Management
- Community Resource Management
- Policy and Program Evaluation
- Systems Management

JUVENILE COMMUNITY-BASED COUNSELOR/CASEWORKER

- Community Resource Development
- Youth Counseling in More Difficult Correctional Setting
- Individualization of Client Relationships
- Wider Understanding of Social and Emotional Disorders

JUVENILE INSTITUTION COUNSELOR/CASEWORKER

- One to One or Small Group Counseling
- Crisis Intervention
- Court Appearances
- Volunteer Group Interfaces
- Community Resource Development

HOUSE PARENT-JUVENILE YOUTH SERVICE WORKER (Institutions)

- Emergency Handling
- Investigation and Search
- Staff/Youth Interaction Procedures
- Court Appearances
- Detention Treatment Planning

JUVENILE COMMUNITY-BASED ADMINISTRATORS

- Leadership Skills
- Fiscal and Budget
- Management
- Planning and Evaluation Techniques
- Administration of Volunteer Groups

JUVENILE INSTITUTION CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

- Leadership Skills
- Crisis Management
- Staff/Youth Relationships
- Fiscal and Budget
- Management
- Planning and Evaluation Techniques

ADULT PROBATION/PAROLE OFFICER

- Responsibilities for Parole and Probation Functions
- Techniques for Handling Private and Public Relationships—jobs and acceptance of clients
- Developing Resources in Community
- Programming for Observation, Evaluation and Assessment of Client
- Workload Allocation Procedures to Paraprofessionals
- Administration of Group and Individual Counseling
- Crisis Intervention—Choice of Mixes of Effective Interventions

Source: NMS Field Job Analysis, 1975.

Chart VI–10

Newer Job and Expanded Role Developments in Corrections

JUVENILE AND ADULT CORRECTIONS (Institutional and Community-Based)

- Planning Specialists
- Community Service Worker
- Youth Counselor (composite counselor and houseparent roles)
- Recreation Specialist
- Community Resources Manager
- Job Developers

JUVENILE PROBATION AND PAROLE

- Intake Specialist
- Court Liaison Specialist
- Vocational Specialist

Source: NMS Field Job Analysis, 1975

The overall superiority of adult corrections over the other areas is probably due, in part, to the fact that standards for adult agencies are set at the state level in most cases, whereas in the case of juvenile corrections the training programs are most often the products of local initiative. Similarly, in the area of probation and parole, the superiority of parole, particularly the more established area of adult parole, in the provision of training also bespeaks the benefits of a comprehensive organizational umbrella.

7. *Recommendations*. The area most in need, on the basis of first priority, of immediate improvement with respect to training is juvenile corrections. It has been found to be deficient in the general provision of training and in the amount of time set aside for training in those agencies that do provide training. Supervisory training, although no less common in juvenile corrections than other areas of corrections, is a second area of deficiency. The amount of training provided to treatment personnel appears to be no more adequate than that provided for custodial staff. Finally, it can be suggested that the need for training in juvenile corrections is not greatly modified by the educational attainment of its personnel. In the case of custodial personnel the difference in educational attainment of adult and juvenile staff is only marginal, and in the case of treatment personnel the educational attainment of juvenile staff is generally lower than that of adult staff.

A second area in need of attention is the area of probation and parole. The difference between this area and juvenile corrections is relatively small with respect to the provision of training. The need for supervisory training is also clearly indicated. Although the educational attainment of probation and parole personnel is superior to all other areas of corrections, thus suggesting some reduction in training needs, it should be recalled that the NAC recommendations, providing for a bachelor's degree, rather than graduate degrees, as the minimum desirable standard were premised on an improvement in the amount of training provided. Finally, the anticipated increase in workload and employment in probation and parole suggests the need to enhance training efforts, particularly at the entry level.

Finally, areas in adult corrections training in need of attention include the provision of supervisory training and an increase in participation in in-service training. Changes in the occupational demands of the adult corrections officer position in the area of rehabilitation may serve to upgrade the educational attainment of correctional officers, and thus may also require an increase in the amount and quality of training.

There will be a requirement for emphasizing certain skills and knowledges in the future training of correctional personnel. These are summarized in Chart VI–9.

There will be a need, based upon field occupational studies, to monitor the growth of occupations listed in Chart VI–10 in order that provisions can be made for their training and education.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *American Correctional Association, Manual of Correctional Standards* (College Park, Maryland: 1966), pp. 171–72.
2. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Corrections* (1967), pp. 100–02.
3. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act* (1969), pp. 76–80.
4. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections* (1973), pp. 494–495.
5. Herman Piven and Abraham Alcabes, *Education, Training and Manpower in Corrections and Law Enforcement: A Digest of Data*, Source Book II, "In-Service Training 1965–1966" (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, no date), pp. 139–140, 154, 217, 277–78.
6. President's Commission of Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, p. 181.
7. Leon R. Jansyn, Jr. "Correctional Officer in Training in America," in *Training the Correctional Officer: The Proceedings of Two Workshops* (Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, no date) p. 47.
8. Howard B. Gill, "Training Prison Officers," in *Behavioral Science and Modern Penology*, ed. William H. Lyle, Jr. and Thetus W. Horner (Charles C. Thomas, 1973), pp. 68–70.
9. Piven and Alcabes, *op. cit.*, pp. 139–40.
10. *Ibid.*, p 140.
11. NMS Occupational Analysis, 1975.
12. Piven and Alcabes, pp. 227–28.
13. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, p. 494.
14. See for example: Daniel Glaser, "The New Correctional Era: Implications for Manpower and Training," in *Issues in Corrections*, ed. Edward Elderfonso (Glencoe Press, 1974), p. 129.
15. The difference in training emphasis indicated here demonstrates the difficulty of assessing training content on a national level. The Vienna facility is a highly innovative, treatment-oriented facility whereas the training provided to other correctional officers reflects the typical security-oriented facilities otherwise maintained by the state.
16. American Correctional Association, pp. 432–33.
17. U.S. Bureau of Prisons, A Look at the Federal Prison System (1974): 8.
18. See, for example, David Fogel, *We are the Living Proof: The Justice Model for Corrections*, (1975): 263–264.

19. President's Commission, p. 123.

20. Nicholas A. Reuterman, "A National Survey of Juvenile Detention Facilities (Delinquency Study and Youth Development Project, Southern Illinois University, no date): 139–40.

21. President's Commission, p. 123.

22. Reuterman, p. 139–140.

23. The pattern of training does not vary significantly when the sex of the juveniles handled by the various agencies is considered. Among agencies dealing exclusively with males approximately 43 percent provide entry-level training. Among agencies handling only female juveniles, the proportion is 49 percent. Among agencies dealing with both males and females, the proportion of agencies providing entry-level training is 52 percent.

24. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *Recent Criminal Justice Unification, Consolidation, and Coordination Efforts* (1976).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Stuart. *A Comparative Study of Recidivism Rates in Six Correctional Systems*. Research Report No. 21. District of Columbia Department of Corrections, 1970.

———. "Cost-Benefit Analysis in Corrections: A Review." Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of Juvenile Delinquency Program Administrators, March 29, 1970. Processed.

———. *Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide*. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

———. "Perceived Impact of Research on Corrections." Report of a survey of 53 adults and 21 youth correctional agencies. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

"All New Probation and Parole Officers Basic On the Job Training." Processed. Bureau of Training. Kentucky Department of Justice, 1975.

American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. *Analysis of Extent of Applicability of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners to Community-Based Supervision and Residential Care for Convicted Offenders*. Columbus: Academy of Contemporary Problems, November 18–22, 1974.

———. *Correctional Policy Positions of the American Bar Association, 1975*. Approved by the House of Delegates of the Association's Ninety-Eighth Annual Meeting, Montreal, August 8–13, 1975.

———. *Remedies and Mechanisms for the Enforcement of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and Similar Guarantees and Principles of Offender Treatment. A Multinational Comparison and Analysis*. Washington, 1974.

———. *Screening for Emotional and Psychological Fitness in Correctional Officer Hiring*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Survey and Handbook on State Standards and Inspection Legislation for Jails and Juvenile Detention Facilities*. 3d ed. Washington, 1974.

ABA Correctional Economics Center. *Community Programs for Women Offenders: Cost and Economic Considerations*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Comparative Costs of State and Local Facilities*. Washington.

———. *Cost Analysis of Community Correctional Centers: Case Study: Indiana*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Cost Analysis of Correctional Standards: Halfway Houses*. Volumes I and II. Washington, 1975.

———. *Cost Analysis of Correctional Standards: Pre-Trial Diversion*. Volumes I and II. Washington, 1976.

———. *Plan for a Cost Analysis of the Correctional Report*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Readings in Correctional Economics*. Washington, D.C., 1975.

———. *Resource Needs of Correctional Administrators: A Survey Report*. Washington, 1974.

ABA National Volunteer Parole Aid Program. *Volunteer Programs in Corrections: A Survey Report*. Washington, 1975.

ABA Resource Center on Correctional Law and Legal Services. *Legal Responsibility and Authority of Correctional Officers: A Handbook on Courts, Judicial Decisions, and Constitutional Requirements*. Washington, D.C., Published jointly by ABA and American Correctional Association, 1974.

———. *Legislating for Correctional Line Officer Education and Training*. ABA and American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

———. *Offender Legal Services*. The Technical Assistance Manual, Washington, D.C., the American Bar Association's Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, 1976.

American Friends Committee. *Struggle for Justice*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1971.

Atkins, Burton M., and Glick, Haney R. eds. *Prisons Protest and Politics*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Barry, David, and Harper, Dean. "Rehabilitation Intervention Program for Sentenced Prisoners." Processed. Rochester: University of Rochester, 1973.

Becker, Arlana H. "Women in Corrections: A Process of Change." *Resolution of Correctional Problems and Issues* 1 (Summer 1975): 19–21.

Beless, Donald W.; Pilcher, William S.; and Ryan, Ellen Jo. "Use of Indigenous Nonprofessionals in Probation and Parole." *Federal Probation* 36 (March 1972): 10–15.

Beless, Donald W., and Rest, Ellen Ryan. *Probation Officer Case Aide Project: Final Report*. Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, 1972.

Benjamin, Judith G.; Freedman, Marcia K.; and Lynton, Edith F. *Pros and Cons: New Roles for Nonprofessionals in Corrections*. Washington: National Committee on Employment of Youth, 1969.

Bennett, Donald; Dart, Richard; and Showalter, Ralph. *Career Ladders in a Criminal Justice System: An Exploratory Study*. Bethesda: Social Development Corporation, 1973.

Berkowitz, Monroe *et al*. *An Evaluation of Policy-Related Rehabilitation Research*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Berks, Richard A. *et al*. *Assessing the Potentials for Change in State Correctional Systems*. An Interim Report. Conducted jointly by The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research; and Northwestern University, 1973.

Berman, John. "The Volunteer in Parole Programs: An Evaluation." *Criminology* 13 (1975): 111–113.

Bottomley, A. Keith. *Decision in the Penal Process*. South Hackensack: Fred B. Rothman and Company, 1973.

Brecher, Edward M., and Penna, Richard D. Della. *Health Care in Correctional Institutions*. Washington, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

Brodsky, Stanley L. "A Bill of Rights for the Correctional Officer." *Federal Probation* 38 (June 1974): 38–40.

Brown, Barry S., and Sisson, John W. Jr. "The Training Program as a Correctional Change Agent." *Crime and Delinquency* 17 (July 1971): 302–309.

Brown, Stephen F. *et al*. "Characteristics and Recidivism of Adult Felony Offenders in Denver." Denver: Denver High Impact Anti-Crime Program, no date.

Carlson, Norman A. "Prisons—A National Challenge." Address before the Kiwanis Club, Birmingham, Alabama, October 28, 1975. Processed.

Carney, Francis J. 'Correctional Research and Correctional Decision-Making." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 6 (July 1969).

Case Management Corrections Services Project. Preliminary Outcome Assessment. Evaluation Report Number 3. Salem: Oregon Law Enforcement Council, 1975.

Case Management Corrections Services Project. Final Outcome Assessment Based on In-Service and Post-Service Offense Comparisons Between Study Groups. Salem: Oregon Law Enforcement Council, 1975.

Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections. *Vienna Staff Training Project: Final Report*. June 1972.

The Challenge of Change in the Correctional Process: Seven Points of View. Papers presented at the New York State Probation Management Institutes, 1971–1972. Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Training Center, 1972.

Clements, Raymond D. *Paraprofessionals in Probation and Parole: A Manual for Their Selection, Training, Induction and Supervision in Day-to-Day Tasks*. Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, 1972.

Coates, Robert B. "A Working Paper on Community-Based Corrections: Concept, Historical Development, Impact, and Potential Dangers." Paper presented at the Massachusetts Standards and Goals Conference, November 18, 1974. Processed.

Coates, Robert B., and Miller, Alden D. "Evaluating Large-Scale Social Service Systems in Changing Environments: The Case of Correctional Agencies." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 12 (July 1975): 92–106.

Cohen, Fred. *Legal Challenge to Corrections: Implications for Manpower and Training*. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

———. *Training in Law for Correctional Personnel: A Proposal and Design*. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Cohn, Alvin Walter. "Decision-Making in the Administration of Probation Services: In-Depth Study of the Probation Manager." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California at Berkeley, 1972.

Cole, George F. "Rethinking Parole." Paper presented at Meeting of Academy of Criminal Justice in Dallas, Texas, March 25–26, 1976. Processed.

Community Corrections Program and Facilities for Maryland. A Summary of the Report of the Community Corrections Committee to the Maryland Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1971.

Community Resource Management Training for Kentucky Probation and Parole Officers. Report of a Pilot Demonstration Project. Louisville: Kentucky Mental Health Manpower Commission, 1974.

Comprehensive Training Program for West Virginia Correctional Personnel. Final Report. West Virginia University, College of Human Resources and Education, September 1968–September 1969.

"A Concurrent Validity Study of Written Examinations for the Employment of Correctional Officers and Counselors in the State of Vermont." Montpelier: Vermont Department of Personnel, 1975.

Cook, Thomas J., and Scioli, Paul P. *Effectiveness of Volunteer Programs in Courts and Corrections. An Evaluation of Policy Related Research*. Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1975.

"Correctional Officer Academy Basic Training Program." Processed. Bureau of Training, Kentucky Department of Justice, 1975.

"Correctional Officer Basic On the Job Training." Processed. Bureau of Training, Kentucky Department of Justice, 1975.

"Correctional Officer/Counselor Performance Measurement Form (Operational)." Processed. Montpelier: Vermont Department of Personnel, 1975.

Correctional Officer Training Guide. Gaithersburg: American Correctional Association, no date.

Correctional Staff Training Institutes. Final Report Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, 1969.

Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Crisis in the Prisons: New York City Responds: A Commitment to Change. Annual Report of the New York City Board of Correction, 1971.

Corsini, R. "Functions of the Prison Psychologist." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 9 (1945): 101–104.

Cressey, Donald R., ed. *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Criminology and Corrections Programs: A Study of the Issues. Proceedings of a Seminar. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Culley, Henry C. "Breaking into Prison is Tougher Than Breaking Out: A Tale of Implementing Innovation." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C., April 1976. Processed.

Culvertson, Robert G. "Corrections: The State of the Art." Paper presented at meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice, Dallas, Texas, March 24–26, 1976. Processed.

Definite Sentencing: An Examination of Proposals in Four States. Council of State Governments. March 1976.

Dershowitz, Alan. "Criminal Sentencing in the U.S.: An Historical and Conceptual Overview." *The Annals*. 423 (1976).

Developmental Laboratory for Correctional Training. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, 1968.

Dodge, Calvert R., ed. *A Nation Without Prisons: Alternatives to Incarceration*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975.

Dubin, Harry N,, and Lyons, Edmund H. "Hostage Taking" Planning and Systematic Change in Metropolitan Setting Helps Avoid Crisis Management." *American Journal of Correction* 38 (July-August 1976): 14–16.

Duffee, David. "Correction Officer Subculture and Organizational Change." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 11 (1974): 155–172.

———. *Correctional Policy and Prison Organization*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Dye, Larry L. *The Offender as a Manpower Resource in the Administration of Justice*. Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Training Center, 1972.

Eldefonso, Edward, ed. *Issues in Corrections*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1974.

Ellis, Desmond; Grasmick, Harold G.; and Gilman, Bernard. "Violence in Prisons: A Sociological Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 80 (1974): 14–63.

Epstein, Robin *et al. The Legal Aspects of Contract Parole*. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1976.

Evaluation of the Effects of Alternatives to Incarceration on Juvenile Offenders: The Cohort Analysis in the Study of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services. Boston: Harvard Law School, Center for Criminal Justice, 1974.

Evaluation of the Offender Aid and Restoration Program. Executive Summary. Washington: MetaMetrics, Inc., 1975.

Evaluation of Youth Service Bureaus. Sacramento: California Department of Youth Authority, 1973.

Evaluative Summary of Research: MAP Program Outcomes in the Initial Demonstration States. College Park: American Correctional Association.

Female Offenders in the Federal Correctional System. Washington: U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 1975.

Final Report from the Select Committee on Minnesota Correctional Institutions. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Corrections, 1974.

Final Report to the Governor of the Citizen's Study Committee on Offender Rehabilitation. Madison: The Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice, 1972.

Five Year Plan for an Adult Corrections System in Florida (1976–1980). Florida Corrections Reform Act 1974. Volumes I, II, and III. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Administration, 1975.

Flanagan, John. "The Imminent Crisis in Prison Population: Where Do We Go From Here?" *American Journal of Corrections* 37 (November/December 1975): 20–21, 36.

Fogel, David. "We Are the Living Proof. . . The Justice Model for Corrections." Cincinnati: The W. H. Anderson Company, 1975.

Fox, Vernon. "Coordination of Volunteer Programs." *Juvenile Justice* 23 (February 1973): 22–31.

Florida Division of Corrections, Correctional Training Institute. *Course of Study; Expanding the Correctional Horizon*. No date.

Frank, Benjamin, ed. *Contemporary Corrections: A Concept in Search of Content*. Reston: Reston Publishing Company, 1973.

"The Future of Corrections." Special Issues. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 381 (January 1969).

Gabel, Patricia *et al*. "Temporary Release in New York State Correctional Facilities." *Albany Law Review* 38 (June 1974).

Galvin, John J., and Karachi, Loren. *Manpower and Training in Correctional Institutions*. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Garabedian, Peter G. "Research and Practice in Planning Correctional Change." *Crime and Delinquency* 17 (January 1971): 41–56.

Genego, William J.; Goldberg, Peter D.; and Jackson, Vicki C. "Parole Release Decision-Making and the Sentencing Process." *The Yale Law Journal* 84 (1975): 812–902.

General Accounting Office. *Conditions in Local Jails Remain Inadequate Despite Federal Funding for Improvements*. LEAA. Washington, April 5, 1976.

———. *Department of Labor's Past and Future Role in Offender Rehabilitation*. Washington, August 7, 1975.

———. *Federal Guidance Needed if Halfway Houses Are To Be a Viable Alternative to Prison*. Washington, May 28, 1975.

———. *Rehabilitating Inmates of Federal Prisons: Special Programs Help, But Not Enough*. Washington, November 6, 1973.

———. *State and County Probation: Systems in Crisis*. LEAA. Washington, May 7, 1976.

———. *Use of Statutory Authority for Providing Inmate Release Funds*. Washington, 1974.

Gettinger, Steve. "Parole Contracts: A New Way Out." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (March 1976): 9–26.

———. "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-Time High." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (September/October 1975): 3–8.

Gibbons, Don C.; Labowitz, Barry D.; and Blake, Gerald F. "Program Evaluation in Correction." *Crime and Delinquency* 22 (July 1976): 309–321.

Gill, Howard B. "Training Prison Officers." In: *Behavioral Science and Modern Penology* edited by William H. Lyle, Jr. and Thetus W. Horner. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1973.

Goffman, Erving. *Asylums*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1969.

Glaser, Daniel. "Achieving Better Questions: A Half Century's Progress in Correctional Research." *Federal Probation* 39 (September 1975): 3–9.

———. *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964.

———, ed. *Handbook of Criminology*. Chicago: Rand-McNally College Publishing Company, 1974.

———. "The New Correctional Era: Implications for Manpower and Training." In: *Issues in Corrections* edited by Edward Eldefonse. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1974.

———. "The New Correctional Era: Implications for Manpower and Training." *Crime and Delinquency* 12 (July 1966): 209–216.

Goldberg, W.A. *Adult Probation in the United States as of October 1974*. 5th ed. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1974.

Goldfarb, Ronald L.; and Singer, Linda R. *After Correction*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1973.

Gottfredson, Don M. "Making Parole Policy Explicit." *Crime and Delinquency*. 21 (January 1975): 34–44.

———, et al. *A National Uniform Parole Reporting System*. Davis: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research and National Probation and Parole Institutes, 1970.

———. *The Utilization of Experience in Parole Decision-Making*. Summary Report. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

Graduated Release. Crime and Delinquency Topics: A Monograph Series. Washington: National Institute of Mental Health, 1974.

Griggs, Betrom S., and McCune, Gary R, *Federal Probation* 36 (June 1972).

Grunhut, Max. *Penal Reform: A Comparative Study*. Montclair: Patterson Smith, 1972.

Guide for Training Newly Appointed Federal Probation Officers: Probation Officer Training Checklist. Washington: Federal Judicial Center, 1974.

Guidelines for Jail Operations. Washington: National Sheriffs' Association, 1972.

Guidelines for the Planning and Design of Regional and Community Correctional Centers for Adults. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1971.

Hahn, Paul H. *Community-Based Corrections and the Criminal Justice System*. Santa Cruz: Davis Publishing Company, 1975.

Hardesty, Don. "A One-Year Personnel Study of the Correctional Officer and His Work in the Kansas Penal Systems." Processed. Topeka, Kansas, 1969.

Harris, Albert. *The Emerging Role of Correctional Service Agencies*. Philadelphia: The Correctional Federation, 1974.

Hecht, Judith A. *Effects of Halfway Houses on Neighborhood Crime Rates and Property Values: A Preliminary Survey*.

Hecker, Benson; Field, Timothy F.; and Powell, Glenn. "Survey of Probation/Parole Supervisors and Counselors." *American Journal of Correction* 38 (March-April 1976): 31–40.

Hodge, E. P. "Crime Prevention by the Indeterminate Sentence Law." *American Journal of Psychiatry* (1971): 291–295.

Holahan, John. *Measuring Benefits from Prison Reform*. Washington: The Urban Institute, 1973.

Hood, Roger, and Sparks, Richard. *Key Issues in Criminology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Hopkins, Andrew. "Imprisonment and Recidivism: A Quasi-Experimental Study." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 13 (January 1976): 13–32.

Huff, Clarence R. "Unionization Behind the Walls: An Analytic Study of the Ohio Prisoner's Labor-Union Movement." Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974.

Human Resource Agencies: Adult Corrections in State Organization Structure. Lexington: The Council of State Governments, 1975.

Illinois Correctional Training Academy, Department of Corrections. *Training Program for Pre-Service Correctional Officer Trainees*. 1976.

Illinois Department of Corrections. "The Current Status of County City Jails." *New Horizons on Detention* 2 (January 1972).

The Illinois Jails Survey of 1967–1968. Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, 1969.

The Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland. *The Change Process in Criminal Justice*. (LEAA Criminal Justice Monograph). Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973.

Jacobs, James B., and Steele, Eric H. "Prisons: Instruments of Enforcement or Social Welfare?" *Crime and Delinquency* 21 (October 1975): 348–355.

Jansyn, Leon R. Jr. "Correctional Officer in Training in America." In: *Training the Correctional Officer: The Proceedings of Two Workshops*. Carbondale: Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, no date.

Jaman, Dorothy R. *Sentences and Offenses: Time Served and Parole Outcome*. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections, 1974.

Johnson, Bertram M. *Parole Agent Job Analysis: Parole Research Project*. Sacramento: California Department of Youth Authority, undated.

Jordan, Frank C., and Cardarelli, Albert P. "Significant Characteristics of Workers in Probation and Parole Agencies: An Assessment of the State of the Art." Processed. Washington: The MITRE Corporation, 1974.

Jurgensen, James D., and Scheir, Ivan H. *Volunteer Training for Courts and Corrections*. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Katsampes, Paul. "Changing Correction Officers: A Demonstration Study." *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 3 (June 1975): 123–144.

Keating, Michael, Jr. *Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions*. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1976.

———. *Improved Grievance Procedures: A Technical Assistance Manual*. Washington: American Bar Association's Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, 1976.

Keller, Oliver J. Jr., and Alper, Benedict S. *Halfway Houses: Community-Centered Correction and Treatment*. Lexington: Heath Lexington Books, 1970.

Keve, Paul W. *Imaginative Programming in Probation and Parole*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

———. *Prison Life and Human Worth*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974.

Kentucky Department of Training, Bureau of Training. *Basic Orientation to Corrections*, January 1975.

Kiessling, J. "Volunteers in Corrections: An Ecological Model." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Correction* 17 (January 1975): 20–34.

Killinger, George C., and Cromwell, Paul F., Jr. *Corrections in the Community: Alternatives to Imprisonment, Selected Readings*. St. Paul, West Publishing Company, 1974.

———. *Penology: The Evolution of Corrections in America*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1973.

Krantz, Sheldon. *Cases and Materials on the Law of Corrections and Prisoners' Rights*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1973.

Kratcosky, Peter C. "The Future Status of Criminology and Corrections Programs in the Field of Sociology." *Probation and Parole* 4 (1972): 49–54.

Kwitny, Martha K. "Our Overcrowded Prisons." *Wall Street Journal*, Wednesday, October 1, 1975.

Lamb, H. Richard, and Goertzel, Victor. "A Community Alternative to County Jail: The Hopes and Realities." *Federal Probation* 39 (March 1975): 33–38.

Lamb, William E. Jr.; Hacker, Judith E.; and Ward, Richard J. "Concept Paper on the Development of Correctional Specialists." Processed. December 18, 1975.

Lerman, Paul. *Community Treatment and Social Control: A Critical Analysis of Juvenile Correctional Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Levy, Girard W.; Abram, Robert A.; and LaDow, Diane. *Final Report on Vocational Preparation in U.S. Correctional Institutions: 1974 Survey*. Columbus: Battelle Columbus Laboratories, 1975.

Lipton, Douglas; Martinson, Robert; and Wilks, Judith. *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Manella, Raymond L. *Post-Institutional Services for Delinquent Youth*. (Social and Rehabilitation Service-HEW). Washington, D.C., 1969.

Manpower and Training in Correctional Institutions. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Manpower Issues for Corrections. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, 1971.

Manual of Correctional Standards. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1966.

Marsh, John J. "Offender Employment Restrictions and Correctional Education." *Journal of Correctional Education* 24 (1974): 10–11.

Martinson, Robert. "What Works—Questions and Answers About Prison Reform." *The Public Interest* 35 (1974): 24–54.

Maryland Correctional Training Commission. *Third Annual Report to the Governor*: July 1, 1973–July 30, 1974.

Matlick, Hans W. "The Contemporary Jails of the United States: An Unknown or Neglected Area of Justice." In: *Handbook of Criminology* edited by Daniel Glaser. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1974.

McConkie, Mark L. *Management by Objectives: A Corrections Perspective*. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

McCorkle, Lloyd W. "Guard-Inmate Relationships." In: *The Sociology of Punishment and Correction* edited by Norman Johnston. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1970.

McCrea, Tully L., and Gottfredson, Don M. *A Guide to Improved Handling of Misdemeanant Offenders*. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974.

McCreary, Phyllis Groom, and McCreary, John M. *Job Training and Placement for Offenders and Ex-Offenders*. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1974.

McKelvey, Blake. *American Prisons: A Study in American Social History Prior to 1915*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Midwest Research Institute. *Development of a Master Plan to Meet Criminal Justice Personnel Training Needs for the State of Georgia*. Final Report to the Georgia Crime Commission, Kansas City, 1974.

Miller, Herbert S. *The Role of Prison Industries Now and in the Future: A Planning Study*. Washington: Georgetown University Law Center, 1975.

Miller, Michael J. "Vocational Training in Prisons: Some Policy Implications." *Federal Probation* 36 (September 1972): 19–21.

Minnich, Stephen D. *Manual: The Planned Implementation of Mutual Agreement Programming in a Correctional System*. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1976.

Moos, Rudolf H. *Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings*. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Morris, Albert. *The Emerging Role of Correctional Service Agencies*. Philadelphia: The Correctional Federation – USA, 1974.

Morris, Norval. *The Future of Imprisonment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Morris, Pauline, and Farida, Beverly. *On License: A Study of Parole*. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Moyer, Frederic D., and Flynn, Edith E. *Correctional Environments*. Urbana: National Clearinghouse for Correctional Programming and Architecture, 1971.

Monahan, J. M. "Corrections in the County-City Jail, Spokane, Washington." Processed. September 1974.

Murton, Thomas O. *Shared Decision-Making as a Treatment Tool in Prison Management*. Minneapolis: The Murton Foundation for Criminal Justice, 1974.

Mutual Agreement Program: A Planned Change in Correctional Service Delivery. Gaithersburg: American Correctional Association, 1973.

Myren, Richard A. "Education for Correctional Careers." *Federal Probation* 39 (June 1975): 51–58.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. *Corrections*. Washington, 1973.

National Center for Social Statistics (HEW). *Statistics on Public Institutions for Delinquency Children 1970*. Washington, 1971.

National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. (Wickersham Commission). *Report on Penal Institutions Probation and Parole*. Washington, 1931.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. *Probation and Parole Directory*. Hackensack, 1976.

Neil, Thomas C. "Who Should Go and Who Should Stay, A Study of Prison Commitments." Probation and Parole (1974): 21–29.

Neithercutt, M.G., and Gottfredson, D.M. *Case Load Size Variation and Difference in Probation/Parole Performance*. Pittsburgh: National Center for Juvenile Justice, no date.

Neithercutt, M.G.; Moseley, William H.; and Wenk, Ernst A. *Uniform Parole Report: A National Correctional Data System*. Davis: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, 1975.

New York Select Committee on Correctional Institutions and Programs. *Final Monitoring Report*. Albany: New York State, 1973.

New York State Division of Probation. "The Paraprofessional Demonstration Project in Probation: A 15-Month Study." Processed. 1971.

Newman, Charles L. *Sourcebook on Probation, Parole and Pardons*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Offenders as Correctional Manpower Resource. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Offender-Based State Corrections Information System. Volume I: The OBSCIS Approach. Sacramento: Search, Inc., 1975.

Ohlin, Lloyd E. *Prisons in America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Ohlin, Lloyd E.; Coates, Robert E.; and Miller, Alden D. "Radical Correctional Reform: A Case Study of the Massachusetts Youth Correctional System." *Harvard Educational Review* (February 1974).

O'Leary, Vincent, and Duffee, David. "Correctional Policy: A Classification of Goals Designed for Change." *Crime and Delinquency* 17 (July 1971): 373–386.

O'Leary, Vincent, and Nuffield, Joan. "A National Survey of Parole Decision-making." *Crime and Delinquency* 19 (July 1973): 378–393.

———. *The Organization of Parole Systems in the United States*. Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1972.

Oregon Corrections Division, Training and Development Section. *Minimum Training*. November 1974.

Palmer, Ted. "Martinson Revisited." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 12 (July 1975): 133–151.

Parole Officer Aide Program. *Only Ex-Offenders Need Apply. Columbus, Ohio*. (LEAA Exemplary Project). Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1976.

"The Parole System." Appendix 32. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 120 (December 1971): 284–377.

Pappas, Nick, ed. *The Jail: Its Operation and Management*. Washington: U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 1973.

Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Taining, 1970.

Piven, Herman, and Alcabes, Abraham. *Education, Training and Manpower in Correctionals and Law Enforcement: A Digest of Data*. Source Book II: In-Service Training 1965 and 1966. Washington: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

———. Pilot Study of Correctional Training and Manpower. *Correctional Institutions*. Volume 2. Washington: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1969.

Plattner, Marc F. "The Rehabilitation of Punishment." *The Public Interest* 44 (Summer 1976): 104–114.

Polk, Kenneth. *The University and Corrections: Potential for Collaborative-Relationships*. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Pope, Carl E. *Offender-Based Transaction Statistics: New Directions in Data Collection and Reporting*. Utilization of Criminal Justice Statistics Project Analytic Report 5. Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1976.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, 1967.

———. *Corrections in the United States, 1966*. Washington, 1967.

———. *Task Force Report: Corrections*. Washington, 1967.

Price of Punishment: Prisons in Massachusetts. Cambridge: Urban Planning Aid, 1974.

Prison Grievance Procedures. Special Report. Raleigh: National Association of Attorneys General, 1974.

Prison Population and Costs—Illustrative Projections to 1980. Washington: U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, 1974.

Proceedings: National Workshop on Corrections and Parole Administrators. New Orleans, Louisiana, February 20–23, 1972 (American Correctional Association).

Proceedings: Second National Workshop on Corrections and Parole Administrators. Sponsored by the American Correctional Association, New Orleans, February 20–23, 1972.

Probation Time Study. Washington: The Federal Judicial Center, 1973.

Probation-Parole Services to Felony and Misdemeanor Offenders. Preliminary. St. Louis High Impact Evaluation Unit, 1973.

Providence Educational Center. (LEAA Exemplary Project). Washington: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1975.

The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections. Report of a survey conducted by Louis Harris and Associates in November 1967. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.

Radzmowicz, Leon, and King, J.F.S. "Concepts of Crime." *London Times Literary Supplement*, September 26, 1975.

Reinarman, Craig, and Miller, Donald. *Direct Financial Assistance to Parolees: A Promising Alternative to Correctional Programming*. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections, 1975.

Rice, Herbert C. "Civil Rights and Corrections: The Impact of LEAA Compliance Requirements." *Resolution of Correctional Problems and Issues* 11 (Summer 1975): 4–6.

Residential Corrections: Alternatives to Incarceration: An Empirical Evaluation of the Fifth Judicial District Department of Court Services. State of Iowa, no date.

Results of Staff Demographic Survey and Training Needs Assessment. Tallahassee: Florida Division of Corrections, 1972.

Reuterman, Nicholas A. *A National Survey of Juvenile Detention Facilities*. Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University, no date.

Riessman, Frank, and Popper, Hermine I. *Up From Poverty*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Roberts, Albert T., comp. and ed. *Correctional Treatment of the Offender*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1974.

Roberts, Albert T. *Sourcebook on Prison Education: Past, Present and Future*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1971.

Robinson, James O. *MAP Markers: Research and Evaluation of the Mutual Agreement Program*. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1975.

Rosenfeld, Anne H. *An Evaluative Summary of Research: MAP Program Outcomes in the Initial Demonstration States*. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1975.

Rothman, David J. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Codes and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Rubin, Sol. *The Law of Criminal Correction*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1973.

Saleebey, George. *Hidden Closets: A Study of Detention Practices in California*. Prepared for the State of California Department of Youth Authority, 1975.

Sarri, Rosemary A. *Under Lock and Key: Juveniles in Jails in Dentention*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1974.

Sarri, Rosemary A., and Hasenfeld, Yeheskel, eds. *Brought to Justice? Juveniles, the Courts, and the Law*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1976.

Sarri, Rosemary A., and Levin, Mark M. *Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis of Legal Codes in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1974.

Schoonmaker, Meyressa H., and Brooks, Jennifer S. "Women in Probation and Parole." *Crime and Delinquency* 21 (April 1975): 109–115.

Schrag, Clarence. *Crime and Justice: American Style*. Washington: National Institute of Mental Health, 1971.

Schwartz, Ira M. "Volunteers and Professionals: A Team in the Correctional Process." *Federal Probation* 35 (September 1971): 46–49.

Scott, Joseph E. *Ex-Offenders as Parole Officers: The Parole Officer Aide Program in Ohio*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975.

"Seminar on the Crisis in Corrections: Summary." Southern Governor's Conference. Task Force Committee on Correctional Problems. Atlanta: Council of State Governments, January 21–23, 1976. Processed.

Serrill, Michael. "Massachusetts: Its Juvenile System Rehabilitates, Officials Say." *Corrections Magazine* 1 (May/June 1975): 33–36.

Seymour, Whitney North, Jr. *Why Justice Fails*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1973.

Sharp, E. Preston. "The Next Decade in Corrections." Paper presented at Meeting of Academy of Criminal Justice in Dallas, Texas, March 24–26, 1976. Processed.

Signurdson, Herbert R.; McEachern, A.W.; and Carter, Robert M. "Administrative Innovations in Probation Service: A Design for Increased Effectiveness." Crime and Delinquency 19 (July 1973): 353–366.

Skoler, Daniel. "Correctional Unification: Rhetoric, Reality, and Potential." *Federal Probation* 40 (March 1976).

Skoler, Daniel, and Lowenstein, Ralph. "Minorities in Corrections." *Crime and Delinquency* 20 (October 1974): 339–346.

Slaikeu, Karl A. "Evaluation Studies on Group Treatment of Juvenile and Adult Offenders in Correctional Institutions: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 10 (January 1973): 87–100.

Smith, Alexander B., and Berhn, Louis. *Treatment of the Criminal Offender: Issues and Problems*. Dobbs Ferry: Oceana Publications, 1974.

Smith, Joan, and Fried, William. *The Uses of the American Prison: Political Theory and Penal Practice*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974.

Standards for Selection of Probation and Parole Personnel. Revised. Hackensack: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1968.

Stanley, David T. *Prisoners Among Us: The Problems of Parole*. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1976.

Status, Selection and Training of Government Grades of Staff of Penal Establishments. Strasbourg: European Committee on Crime Problems, 1969.

Stein, Philip. "Are Probation Officers Really Professionals?" *Crime and Delinquency* 17 (July 1971): 296–301.

Stollmack, Stephen. "Predicting Inmate Population from Arrest, Court Disposition, and Recidivism Rates." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 10 (July 1973): 141–162.

Study Guide for the Application of the Manual of Correctional Standards. College Park: American Correctional Association, 1973.

Study of Recidivism for Inmates Released from Custody During October Through December 1972. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Offender Rehabilitation, 1975.

Sturmthal, Joan. "California's Probation Subsidy Program." *State Government* 47 (Winter 1974): 27–31.

Survey of Correctional Systems in the South. Atlanta: Council of State Governments, 1974.

Targets for In-Service Training. Report of a Seminar. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1967.

Thomas, Greg. *Corrections in Monroe County, New York 1970–1973*. Rochester: University of Rochester, 1974.

Thurow, Lester. "The Economic Progress of Minority Groups." Paper presented at Rutger's University Equal Employment Opportunity Symposium, September 1975. Processed.

A Time to Act. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Training for Corrections: Rationale and Techniques. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, no date.

Training the Correctional Officer: The Proceedings of Two Workshops. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, 1964.

Twentieth Century Fund. *Fair and Certain Punishment*. New York, 1976.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Persons in Institutions and Other Group Quarters, 1970*. Census of Population. Subject Report. Washington, 1973.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Juvenile Court Statistics*. Washington, 1973.

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Uniform Crime* Reports. Washington, 1969–1974.

———. *A Look at the Prison System Facilities*. Washington, no date.

———. *Female Offenders in the Federal Correctional System*. Washington, 1975.

———. *National Prisoner Statistics*, Washington, 1959, 1960, and 1962.

———. *National Prisoner Statistics, State Prisoners: Admissions and Releases*. Washington, 1970.

———. *National Prisoner Statistics, Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions*. Washington, 1974.

U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. *Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974*. Advance Report. Washington, 1975.

———. *Children in Custody: Advance Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1972–73*. Washington, May 1975.

———. *Compendium of Model Correctional Legislation and Standards*. 2d. ed. Washington, 1975.

———. *Criminal Justice Agencies in the U.S.*. Summary Report. 1970. Washington, 1971.

———. *Local Jails*. Washington, 1970.

———. *The Nation's Jails: A Report on the Census of Jails from 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*. Washington, 1975.

———. *National Prisoner's Statistics Bulletin*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1971, 1972, and 1973*. Washington, 1975.

———. *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, 1970–1971, 1974.

———. *Success and Failure of Federal Offenders Released in 1970*. Washington, 1974.

———. *Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1974*. Washington, 1976.

———. *Survey of Inmates of Local Jails*. Advance Report. Washington.

———. "Visiting Fellowship Program: Recent Criminal Justice Unification, Consolidation and Coordination." Washington, 1976.

U.S. Manpower Administration. *Training Needs in Correctional Institutions*. Washington, 1974.

U.S. Department of Labor. *Manpower Report of the President*. Washington, 1975.

Venezia, Peter S. *et al*. *Unofficial Probation: An Evaluation of its Effectiveness*. Davis: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, 1972.

Viano, Emilio, ed. *Criminal Justice Research*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975.

Vintner, Robert D., ed. *Time Out: A National Study of Juvenile Correctional Programs*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1976.

Vintner, Robert D.; Downs, George; and Hall, John. *Juvenile Corrections in the States: Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization*. A Preliminary Report. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1975.

Virginia Division of Adult Services. *Correctional Officer Institutional Training Program of Instruction*, no date.

Volunteers Look at Corrections. Report of a survey made by Louis Harris and Associates. Washington: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969.

Von Hirsch, Andrew. *Doing Justice: The Choice of Punishments*. Report of the Committee for the Study of Incarceration, 1975.

Warren, Margaret A. *Correctional Treatment in Community Centers*. Washington, 1972.

West, D. J. *The Future of Parole*. London: Ducksworth, 1972.

Wheeler, Gerald R. "The Computerization of Juvenile Correction." *Crime and Delinquency* 22 (April 1976): 201–210.

Wicker, Tom. *A Time to Die*. New York: Quadrangle Press, 1975.

Wilkins, Leslie T. "Current Aspects of Penology: Directions for Corrections." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 118 (1974): 235–247.

Wilson, James Q. "Lock-Em Up and Other Thoughts on Crime." *The New York Times Magazine* (March 9, 1975).

Witkowski, Gregory. *Probation Officer Case Aide Project*. Final Report. Phase II. Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, no date.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978 O—262-932

161